Individually Guided Education (IGE) is an elementary school program that replaces the self-contained classroom with an instructional unit composed of a unit leader, three to five teachers, paraprofessionals and clerical aides, and 100 to 150 children. Its program includes innovations such as nongraded instruction, team teaching, continuous progress, peer-group instruction, and differentiated staffing. IGE has seven major components: 1) an organization for instruction, a related administrative organization at the building level and another arrangement at the central office level; 2) a model of instructional programming for the individual student; 3) a model for developing measurement tools and evaluation procedures; 4) curriculum materials; 5) a program of home-school communications; 6) good communication among parts of the school system; and 7) continuing research and development. The first two of these are explained in this booklet, which also recounts experiences of schools which have adopted the program. A list of such schools is included. (JK)
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Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit School

OVERVIEW

A new form of elementary school organization—Individually Guided Education (IGE)—has been revolutionizing U.S. classrooms at an ever increasing rate.

Perhaps revolutionizing isn't the best word to use in describing IGE or the multiunit school, as it is also known because of its organizational arrangement. A more descriptive word would be evolutionary because IGE has been evolving from underlying concepts that have been known to educators for a decade or more. IGE designers say they are deliberately attempting to retain the best practices of the past decades and to substitute new ones where they are needed. To this end, the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, in cooperation with several educational institutions, developed new organizational arrangements to replace age-graded, self-contained classrooms. They called the new arrangement the multiunit school.

The Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ (the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, a division of the Kettering Foundation) combined their ideas in 1969 to encourage IGE's growth. Both /I/D/E/A/ and the Wisconsin center see their task as no small one, but one that can be solved. "Millions of children are depending on us...each with different needs...each with different learning styles...each waiting to be educated," /I/D/E/A/ said in its booklet, Individually Guided Education. "...There is a way...to manage our available educational resources to approach each child individually and still provide an education for all—a way to teach children one at a time, together. That way is Individually Guided Education, a system for developing learning programs to meet individual needs," /I/D/E/A/ said.

The multiunit school can be traced back to 1964-65 when Project MODELS (Maximizing Opportunities for Development and Experimentation in Learning in the Schools) began at the Wisconsin center under the direction of Herbert J. Klausmeier, professor of educational psychology at the U. of Wisconsin. He was joined by representatives of 13 Wisconsin school systems and the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction. Their aim was to initiate "a new type of organization...in the school building to deal with some of the mutual concerns of the center, the school systems and the
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State Dept. of Public Instruction regarding the development of exemplary instructional systems and sophisticated experimentation."

Roles and functions of unit staff were defined during the next few months. As a result of this project, the Wisconsin center and three school districts cooperatively started in 1966 the first 13 nongraded instructional and research units as replacements for age-graded classes in schools at Madison, Janesville and Racine, Wis.

In 1966-67, the number of functioning instructional and research units increased to 19, and by the next school term seven elementary schools in the same school districts were completely organized into multiunit schools for the first time. The emerging system became known as Individually Guided Education.

A significant forward thrust in implementation occurred when the Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction selected the multiunit school for statewide demonstration and installation during the 1968-69 school year. In cooperation with the Wisconsin center and four teacher-education institutions, the state education department started eight "lighthouse" or demonstration schools in seven school districts, bringing the number of totally organized multiunit schools in Wisconsin to 15. State Supt. William C. Kahl, in citing the state education department's reason for selecting the multiunit school for implementation, said it showed:

"the greatest promise as a facilitative environment for improving learning opportunities at the elementary school level.... Within the unit structure provided, both the instructional and learning components support effective use of time, talent and effort. Roles are differentiated and opportunities are provided for planning, sharing and evaluation. Provision is inherent in the design to encourage cooperative effort in teacher education and research activities at the local education level."

In the 1969-70 school year 50 multiunit schools operated in 23 Wisconsin districts. Another leap forward in implementation and refinement occurred in 1969, when the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ entered into an agreement whereby /I/D/E/A/ used center-developed printed materials and videotapes to prepare their first generation multimedia inservice materials. Insights from /I/D/E/A/ 's Study of Educational Change, which began in the spring of 1966, were also incorporated into the materials.

In 1970-71, /I/D/E/A/-developed materials were used to implement multiunit schools for the first time—primarily in Colorado, South Carolina and Wisconsin. By the 1970-71 school year, 164 IGE or multiunit schools were operating in eight states; of these, 99 were in Wisconsin. The New Jersey State Dept. of Education was so impressed with the results of its IGE program in 25 multiunit schools for the 1971-72 school year that it authorized grants and assistance to 40 more schools for the 1972-73 school year.

The most recent implementation thrust came when the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) selected the multiunit school for nationwide installation in the 1971-72 school year. HEW funded the Wisconsin center's effort to carry out IGE implementation in more than 250 new schools in 13
states. Other new multiunit schools started by /I/D/E/A/ brought the total number of IGE schools to well above 500 in 18 states in 1971-72. And, according to the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/, dramatic growth can be expected in the future. Approximately 350 new schools are working with the Wisconsin center in the 1972-73 school year, as well as 200 with /I/D/E/A/. Thus, some schools are working only with /I/D/E/A/, others only with the Wisconsin center, and some with both /I/D/E/A/ and the center.

IGE: A Total System of Elementary Education

What makes IGE so popular? Why are so many new multiunit schools starting? Two reasons stand out. First, IGE is a comprehensive design—a total system of elementary education—that provides a realistic alternative to the age-graded, self-contained classroom and the traditional form of organization that makes children adapt to the system instead of adapting the system to meet the needs of each individual child.

Part of IGE's comprehensive design is its focus on attaining clearly stated objectives through individualized instruction: not individualized instruction when it is viewed merely as students learning through direct interaction with instructional materials and little or no assistance from teachers, but individualized instruction in which self-instructional materials and procedures are taken as just one element of each student's instructional program.

The dominant thrust in attempting to improve American education over the past several years has been individualized instruction. Every teacher recognizes that a class of 25 children, though all of about the same age, can differ dramatically in their abilities, their interest in one subject rather than another, and their preferences for one form of instruction over others.

Most teachers have always recognized that every child is an individual. But, even with this recognition, students, by and large, have been forced to fit into an existing system without regard for their individual differences. IGE tries to solve this problem by encouraging instructional programs for each individual student so that his objectives may be attained. This calls for:

- Planning instructional programs which allow each student to progress at his own rate.
- Providing instructional materials (textbooks, audiovisual materials, demonstrations) which can accommodate individual learning styles.
- Organizing modes of instruction—large-group instruction, small-group instruction, independent study, one-to-one instruction—to suit each child's best learning style.
- Matching teachers and students so that each student has the help of the teacher who best suits him for each specific learning task.

Too often, in cases where instruction is supposedly individualized, it is fragmented. In such cases, individualized instruction is not truly individualized. In the March-April 1972 issue of Florida Schools, Blanche
McMullen, an elementary education consultant in the Florida State Dept. of Education, addressed herself to this problem.

"A program is either individualized or it is not," she wrote. "There is no such thing as being partly human, or human in mathematics, or human for one year of your life. Neither can any instructional program for individuals be partly individualized. An individualized program is also ungraded," she continued. "How can it be otherwise if it is individualized? An individualized program is diagnostic. On what other basis should a teacher prescribe? A humanistic program is individualized. How else is one more human?

"To use any one of these terms to define a program when all the others are not included also seems educationally irresponsible, adds to the confusion and contributes to the disillusionment of teachers," Mrs. McMullen said.

She cited some instances of what she referred to as "fragmented" individualized programs:

- "Teachers 'hung up' on writing packages (prescriptions) for children, but no time to talk to a child.
- "Teachers who use the same sequence of prescriptions for children. (They use them at different times for different children.)
- "Teachers who never write prescriptions, but whose children are much involved in 'different activities.'
- "Children who frequently have to spend an entire day in isolation in order to 'get through' their individualized prescriptions.
- "Children whose only alternative to isolation is large-group instruction.
- "Schools which have individualized or ungraded fourth-grade reading...."

At no time does Mrs. McMullen single out any particular program of individualized instruction to either praise or attack it. Her primary concern is to make any such program truly individualized. She also recognizes that certain objectives can be attained only through interactions among students and between a teacher and students. IGE has the same aim. And IGE, fully implemented in a school, is designed to eliminate the fragmented individualization programs that currently exist in many schools, its developers say.

The second reason that IGE is growing in popularity, according to proponents, is that it encourages the adaptation of some of the most talked about innovations of the past two decades—team teaching, differentiated staffing, inquiry-directed learning, multi-age grouping, peer instruction, open classrooms, continuous progress learning, programmed instruction, computer-assisted instruction and others. Few have ever been adopted by school systems on a large-scale basis. Changes in education, by and large, have been isolated, piecemeal, small in scope and, often, temporary, IGE developers say. Promising ideas tested and proved in one classroom or in one school system have been slow in affecting classroom practices and procedures elsewhere. Why this lack of impact? There are several reasons. Some innovations, despite all
the praise, haven't proved to be practicable or workable except in very specific situations and for certain teachers. Some innovations require large outlays for new equipment or specialized training and have proved to be too expensive for many districts. Some innovations, after being tried by outstanding teachers, fall by the wayside because less outstanding teachers lack the interest to try them. And, perhaps the most compelling reason for the reduced effectiveness of some innovations is that many teachers simply don't know how to incorporate them into the class or feel that if adopted, they would somehow violate teacher control in the self-contained classroom.

The IGE system particularly attacks this last problem. First, the self-contained classroom is eliminated in the IGE system. It is replaced with an instructional unit composed of a unit leader, three to five teachers, additional supportive staff (paraprofessionals, clerical aides, etc.) and 100 to 150 children. With this type of arrangement, a number of the innovations of recent vintage must come into play as part of the total instructional program. The following are some of the innovations that are a basic part of IGE:

- Nongraded instruction, in which every student either works independently or is grouped and regrouped with others according to his progress toward or interest in attaining his instructional objectives regardless of age or years in school.

- Team teaching, in which groups of teachers assess pupil progress, devise instructional strategies to solve individual problems, divide teaching assignments according to specific abilities and interests of each individual member of the team, and help one another grow professionally.

- Continuous progress, in which every student advances as quickly as he can or as slowly as he must depending only on his individual ability.

- Peer-group instruction, in which students of different ages work together in either small groups or in pairs to solve common problems.

- Differentiated staffing, in which outstanding teachers serve as unit leaders of a team in order to direct the education of children and to provide leadership and assistance to other teachers.

In summary, IGE supporters claim it is a total system of elementary education—one concerned first with changing the organization for instruction and the related staffing pattern so that instructional improvements can more readily occur. It takes a broad view of education and instruction in which true individualization to attain all of the school's educational objectives is achieved by varying certain elements—student instructional programs, instructional materials, modes of instruction and teachers. It encourages the adaptation and implementation of those innovations that are consistent with the total IGE system. IGE supporters also claim it is the first realistic alternative in this century to the age-graded, self-contained classroom—the traditional form of elementary school organization.

In this special report, we will take a look at the inner workings of the IGE system, its adoption in schools across the country, reactions to IGE by several different publics, and how it is working in practice.
HOW IGE WORKS

IGE is a comprehensive form of education and instruction designed to produce higher levels of educational achievement by providing for differences among students in rates of learning, learning styles and other characteristics. IGE supporters claim it is more comprehensive than other individualization programs that provide for little or no contact with teachers and that give little or no attention to attaining important educational objectives through small group activities.

Further, some teacher instruction of groups rather than only of individuals is essential so that IGE costs do not markedly exceed those of the traditional system. Therefore, in IGE, individual instruction is just one of several modes of learning situations.

But IGE is really more than just an instructional program. The thing that must always be kept in mind is that IGE has many related parts that must function smoothly in the same school building. In fact, there are seven major components of IGE:

- An organization for instruction, a related administrative organization at the building level and another arrangement at the central office level. This new type of organization, called the multiunit organization, is designed to provide for educational and instructional decision making at several different levels; to open communication among students, teachers and principals; to institute accountability by educational personnel at various levels. (See figures 1 and 2 for a comparison in organizational arrangements of an IGE multiunit school and a traditional elementary school.)

- A model of instructional programming for the individual student. This is designed to aid teachers in planning and carrying out an instructional program for each student that takes into account his objectives, rate of learning, level of motivation, etc. It also provides the structure for developers to prepare curriculum materials for IGE schools. (See figures 3 and 4.)

- A model for developing measurement tools and evaluation procedures. The model includes preassessment of children's readiness; assessment of progress, and of final achievement with criterion-referenced tests; feedback to the teacher and the child; and evaluation of the IGE design and its components. This model is used by teachers, mainly in selecting and using assessment tools and by curriculum developers in preparing instructional packages.
**Figure 1: Organization of Multiunit School with 600 Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Office Staff</th>
<th>State Department of Education Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit A</th>
<th>Unit B</th>
<th>Unit C</th>
<th>Unit D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit Leader</td>
<td>1 Unit Leader</td>
<td>1 Unit Leader</td>
<td>1 Unit Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Teachers</td>
<td>4 Teachers</td>
<td>4 Teachers</td>
<td>4 Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructional Aide</td>
<td>1 Instructional Aide</td>
<td>1 Instructional Aide</td>
<td>1 Instructional Aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Clerical Aide</td>
<td>1 Clerical Aide</td>
<td>1 Clerical Aide</td>
<td>1 Clerical Aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Pupils, Age 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>150 Pupils, Age 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>150 Pupils, Age 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>150 Pupils Age 9, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Organization of Traditional Elementary School with 600 Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Pupils Age 5</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 6</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 7</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 8</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 9</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 10</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Pupils Age 5</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 6</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 7</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 8</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 9</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 10</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Pupils Age 6</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 7</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 8</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 9</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 10</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 11</td>
<td>30 Pupils Age 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State the educational objectives to be attained by the student population of the building after a year and longer time periods in terms of levels of achievement and other performance related to each curriculum area and in terms of other values and action patterns.

Estimate the range of objectives that may be obtainable for subgroups of the student population.

Assess the level of achievement, learning style and motivation level of each student by use of criterion-referenced tests, observation schedules and work samples with appropriate-sized subgroups.

Set specific instructional objectives for each child to attain over a short period of time.

Plan and implement an instructional program suitable for each student by varying (a) the amount of attention and guidance by the teacher, (b) the amount of time spent in interaction among students, (c) the use of printed materials, audiovisual materials and direct experiencing of phenomena, (d) the use of space and equipment (media), and (e) the amount of time spent by each student in one-to-one interactions with the teacher or media, independent study, adult- or student-led small group activities and adult-led large group activities.

 Assess students for attainment of initial objectives and for setting the next set of instructional objectives.

From Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit Elementary School, Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning
Figure 4: The IGE Cycle

Assessment
What has Johnny learned?

$1/4 + 1/4 = 2/4$
$2/3 + 1/3 = 3/3$
$1/8 + 3/8 = 4/8$
$1/4 + 1/2 = 2/6$
$1/3 + 5/6 = 6/6$

Reassessment
Has Johnny achieved his objectives?

$2/8 + 2/4 = 3/4$
$2/3 + 4/6 = 8/6$
$3/8 + 1/4 = 5/8$

Objectives
What does Johnny need to learn?

"To demonstrate his ability to add unlike fractions."

Learning Program
How can we select and manage the following elements to help Johnny meet his learning objective:

Johnny works well with small groups, he likes to manipulate things, and he responds well to Mr. Smith.

Teacher/Learner Activities
Materials and Media
Time, Space, Equipment
Personnel
Grouping

Thus, Johnny might be grouped with five other children who need to learn how to add unlike fractions, and Mr. Smith will use cuisenaire rods to help them learn.

From An Overview of Individually Guided Education, c1971, /I/D/E/A/
Curriculum materials, related statements of instructional objectives, and criterion-referenced tests and observation schedules. The Wisconsin center is developing materials for reading, prereading, mathematics, environmental education and motivation in line with the models of instructional programming and assessment mentioned. Some of these will be available commercially, starting in 1973-74. However, there is presently a shortage of materials suitable for IGE practices, and most schools adopt and adapt materials that suit the characteristics of their students.

A program of home-school communications that reinforces the school's efforts by generating the interest and encouragement of parents and other adults whose attitudes influence pupil motivation and learning. Both the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ stress that the initial impetus for adoption of IGE should come from a school system's teaching staff. And both organizations insist that schools and school districts involve parents in discussing, initiating and implementing IGE.

Facilitative environments in school buildings, school system central offices, state education agencies and teacher education institutions. The Wisconsin center believes that the key to successful implementation of IGE is close cooperation among the IGE schools of the district, the school district central office and the state education agency. The center has organized such cooperative arrangements in 14 states and continues to coordinate this effort. Both /I/D/E/A/ and the Wisconsin center feel that information-sharing networks among IGE schools are important. (See p.37-40 for the names of /I/D/E/A/ facilitators and of state coordinators and contact persons for the Wisconsin center.) Institutions participating in the /I/D/E/A/ Change Program have developed Leagues of Cooperating Schools. Each League is composed of up to 15 schools and is headed by a facilitator. The facilitator is a full-time person from the state education agency, local university or school district who has agreed to work with the IGE schools. One of the facilitator's goals is to set up a league newsletter that keeps members informed about IGE.

Continuing research and development to generate knowledge and to produce tested materials and procedures. A major feature of the IGE system is that it is not rigid. Instead, it is designed to be continuously changing and improving. It is still being refined based on the experiences of the people involved. In addition, each multiunit school has to try new things, evaluate them and engage in practical research to design, implement and evaluate instructional programs for individual students.

The first two components mentioned above, the school organization and the instructional program, are, of course, the primary parts of IGE. A more detailed description of each follows.

The Organizational Setup

There are three distinct levels of operation within the organizational structure of IGE: the I & R unit (instructional and research unit); the IIC (instructional and improvement committee); and the SPC (systemwide policy committee).
The I & R unit is the nongraded organization for instruction that replaces the age-graded, self-contained classroom. Each unit (see figure 1, p.7) consists of a unit leader, three to five teachers, an instructional aide, a clerical aide and up to 150 children. The number of staff members in a unit can vary. In some cases, there will be no aides. In other cases the aides will be paid paraprofessionals or volunteers. The number of supportive assistants in any given unit will depend in large part on how much the school district is able to pay and its policy regarding the employment of noncertified teachers.

The primary function of the I & R unit is planning and carrying out the instructional program for each child in the unit. This team assesses each child's level of achievement, learning style and motivation level by using various kinds of tests, by observing each student and by examining work samples from each student. The team then works out specific instructional objectives for each child to complete over a short period of time. After working out an instructional program for each child, the team reassesses each student's progress and achievement to determine if the initial objectives were attained. It then decides on the next set of instructional objectives. (See figure 4, p.9.)

The I & R unit is also responsible for researching new ways to teach children and to assess children's learning levels. Through experimentation and observation, unit teachers develop new ways of teaching. These new teaching techniques are then passed on to other teachers in other units by the principal and the unit leaders.

The IIC is composed of the building principal and all of the unit leaders in the building. (See figure 1, p.7.) The IIC has four main functions:

- To formulate the educational objectives and outline the educational program for the entire school building.
- To interpret and implement the systemwide and statewide policies that affect the educational program of the building.
- To coordinate the activities of each of the I & R units in the building for the necessary continuity in all curriculum areas.
- To arrange for the use of facilities, time, materials and other items that the individual units do not manage independently.

Starting an IIC involves a change in the role of the school principal. In the multiunit school the principal assumes greater and more direct administrative responsibility for developing the educational program, managing the preservice and inservice training activities and administering research and development activities.

The SPC is the systemwide policy committee. It includes the school superintendent or his designee, various consultants and other central office staff, the principals of multiunit schools, the unit leaders and multiunit school teachers. The primary purpose of the SPC is to make the transition from the self-contained classroom to the multiunit organization.
The Staff

What are the roles and responsibilities and objectives of the principal, unit leader and teachers in IGE?

IGE specialists say a training program is necessary before a school implements IGE. Both the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ suggest that any teacher who does not agree with the concept should be permitted to transfer to another school in the district. (As an added note of information, IGE authorities assert that the system cannot be imposed on a school or its staff from above. The teaching staff must agree that this is the kind of system it wishes to put into the school.)

The major part of the inservice training for IGE teachers focuses on getting teachers to think as members of a team, working together to provide an individualized instructional program for each child. The IGE training program is also designed to help staff members in an IGE school recognize their changing attitudes and through simulations to provide them with experience in an individualized learning program.

Both the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ offer detailed teacher inservice programs and multimedia materials which vary somewhat in strategy and emphasis but little in purpose. In its Implementation Guide, the center outlines the objectives to be attained by a multiunit school. These are organized under four headings: instructional programming, organizational operations, staff development and home-school-community relations. In its Implementation Guide, /I/D/E/A/ lists 35 outcomes to be achieved by various members of the IGE school personnel. The outcomes are also divided into two basic categories--"Instructional Process of IGE" and "Self-Improvement Process of IGE." Together, the outcomes listed in the Implementation Guide clearly establish the direction for a school implementing IGE. And, as attitudes and responses to outcome questionnaires change, it is easy to determine the degree of implementation of IGE and the areas of concern. The list of outcomes follows:

**IGE Outcomes for the Instructional Process**

**Responsibility of the Principal**
- The entire school is organized into units with each unit composed of a unit leader, teachers, auxiliary personnel and students.
- Each unit is comprised of approximately equal numbers of two or more student age groups.
- Unit teachers have sufficient time in which to conduct unit meetings (a minimum of three hours per week).

**Responsibility of the Unit Leader**
- Each unit makes the decisions regarding time, space, materials, staff and students assigned to that unit.
- Unit teachers practice role specialization and a division of labor when planning for the students' learning programs.
- Unit teachers decide on broad goals to be emphasized, based upon a discussion of previous accomplishments of the unit members.
• Unit teachers develop a collection of student learning objectives consistent with the broad goals of the learning program.
• Unit teachers develop plans for diversified activities in which students may pursue each of the desired learning objectives.
• The unit selects and/or develops curricular materials which include the following components: assessment methods, specific learning objectives, a variety of learning activities using different media, student performance records.
• Large groups, small groups, paired situations and independent study are provided as optional learning modes.
• The collective teaching strengths of unit teachers are used as a result of unit planning when constructing teaching-learning environments.
• Options exist for providing a greater range of teaching-learning environments.
• Parents reinforce implementation of the instructional process of IGE by giving vocal support to the program.
• Parents are involved in the instructional process of IGE.

Responsibility of the Teacher
• Individual teacher's decisions are consistent with the unit's operations.
• The following are considered when students are matched to learning activities: peer relationships, achievement, learning styles, interest in subject areas, self-concept.
• Unit teachers insure that each student has personal rapport established with at least one teacher.
• Adequate opportunity is provided (through discussion and written communication) to insure that each teacher is fully aware of perceptions and suggestions of other unit members relating to the students with whom each has developed special rapport.
• Each student is involved in self-assessment procedures and analyses of the assessments.
• Each student accepts increasing responsibility for selection of his learning objectives.
• Each student participates in the selection of learning activities to pursue learning objectives.
• Each student can state learning objectives for the learning activities in which he is engaged.

IGE Outcomes of the Self-Improvement Process

Responsibility of the League Facilitator
• The league coordinates an interchange of personnel to identify and alleviate problems within the league schools.
• The league stimulates an interchange of solutions to existing problems and is a source of ideas for new development.
• The league devotes time to analyzing and improving league operations.

Responsibility of the Principal
• Assignments of staff members to units are made with regard to complementary strengths and professional compatibility of the teachers.
The IIC resolves problems involving two or more units.
- The IIC coordinates curricular development to insure continuity of educational goals and learning objectives throughout the school.
- The IIC coordinates schoolwide inservice educational programs.
- The IIC provides channels of two-way communication throughout the school.
- The IIC devotes time to analyzing and improving committee operations.

Responsibility of the Unit Leader
- The unit's plans submitted by the resource teachers are constructively criticized by unit members.
- Teacher performances in the learning environment are constructively criticized by unit members using both planned and informal observations.
- The unit devotes time to analyzing and improving unit operations.

Responsibility of the Teacher
- Staff members of an IGE school have a personalized program enabling each to learn and to implement IGE.

The Role of the Unit Leader

IGE encourages differentiated staffing, but not to the degree that is expressed in other plans which call for a huge proliferation of new roles and titles for personnel. The multiunit school calls for just one new role—that of unit leader. And, unlike many differentiated staffing plans which call for the master teacher to be primarily a teacher-trainer, that role is only one of several functions of a unit leader. The unit leader, in addition to being a member of the IIC and leader of the I & R unit, is also a teaching member of the unit.

The following are the unit leader's responsibilities:

Instruction
- Assume leadership in developing, carrying out and evaluating IGE in the unit—including objectives, materials, equipment and activities.
- Work closely with the unit staff, building principal, subject matter specialists and other consultants.
- Coordinate assessment of children's characteristics and progress in the unit and the placement of children in appropriate activities.
- Assume leadership in establishing good home-school relations.
- Teach about 50% to 80% of the time or be directly involved with the children in other ways.
- Utilize some of the remaining time to act as liaison between the principal and unit staff (and students); meet with staff members to plan instruction and to enhance the understanding of IGE, and meet with the IIC.
- Keep abreast of advances in subject knowledge, instructional materials and other components of a system of individually guided education.

Staff Development
- Develop, cooperatively with the IIC, the building principal and relevant
central staff, a building program of on-the-job education for certified personnel of the unit, including teacher interns.

- Develop and carry out a similar program for nonteaching aides.
- Coordinate the inservice training activities of both teaching and nonteaching staff whereby the capabilities of nonteaching aides are identified and improved and teachers learn to work effectively with aides.
- Develop, with the IIC, the building principal, relevant central staff and representatives of teacher-education institutions, a training program for teacher interns.

**Research**

- Plan research activities of the unit with appropriate personnel.
- Coordinate research activities with the I & R unit.
- Guide the administration of experimental treatments--instructional methods, materials, media--by sub-experimenters (teachers or others) to insure continuous adherence to the specified experimental design and to a schedule for collecting information.
- Guide the collection and, as time permits, the analysis of information collected.
- Keep abreast of relevant research results and methods.

**Development**

- Plan the development activities of the unit with the appropriate personnel of the unit, building, central office and other agencies.
- Coordinate the development of a system of individually guided education within the unit, including a statement of objectives, the assessment of the capabilities of students, the instructional program and evaluation procedures.
- Participate directly in preparing instructional materials, diagnostic procedures, measurement instruments, etc.

**Innovation**

- Coordinate the introduction of novel instructional materials, measurement and evaluation tools and procedures, instructional methods, etc.
- Stimulate the invention of new instructional methods within the unit.
- Keep abreast of innovations throughout the school system, state and nation through visits, conferences and reading.

**Diffusion**

- Provide for the proper briefing of observers of the I & R unit.
- Participate in the planning and actual diffusion of promising practices within the school building and system.

A great deal of staff interaction among staff members and with the students is considered essential by IGE authorities. In addition, the IGE model requires a great deal of time for assessing each child's abilities and learning styles and for planning the instructional program for each child. Representatives of both the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ stress that in terms of time and effort, the IGE system requires more time for assessment and planning than
the traditional self-contained classroom. The IGE system also requires considerably more decision making by small groups of teachers rather than by individual teachers. No teacher or principal in the ideal IGE operation works independently of everyone else.

Curriculum Materials

One of the hazards with any new kind of system or program is the selection and adaptation of materials. The Wisconsin center is developing materials in several areas that will be commercially available to traditionally organized as well as multiunit schools, starting in 1973-74. However, the use of these materials is not required. In fact, both the center and /I/D/E/A/ suggest that each multiunit school should examine the materials available and select those that suit the needs of its students.

The center, in addition, recommends that all materials be as consistent as possible with the center's model of instructional programming. This enables teachers to do more teaching and to spend less time in developing materials and tests. Therefore, IGE practitioners must keep in mind that the objectives of IGE and the nature of the instructional programming sequence require high quality, tested materials to achieve specified objectives.

Multiunit schools are notified as soon as newly developed curriculum materials are available for large-scale field testing and are encouraged to participate. Each school is invited to send representatives to an inservice workshop to learn how to properly implement the particular curriculum component.

The Wisconsin center specialists recommend the following procedures for identifying and using instructional materials:

- Educational objectives for the school district are stated.

- A systemwide committee identifies possible printed materials (textbooks, supplementary texts, programmed materials, library books) and audiovisual materials (motion pictures, sound tapes, filmstrips, slides, recordings, etc.) as well as self-contained multimedia packages.

- The building staff reviews the systemwide list and selects those materials that are most appropriate to attain specific instructional objectives. (All materials are keyed to these objectives and special material related to each curriculum area is available.)

- Material is selected and organized so that the same concepts may be introduced to a large group by means of a film, for example, and to a smaller group by means of slides or in another manner that is equally easy to handle. And, the same concepts should also be available in a form that is easily used by a student independently, to accommodate his individual learning style and rate of learning.

Although many existing materials can be adapted for the multiunit school, IGE specialists say it is probably easier and less time-consuming to select new materials with many of the educational objectives built in.
Who Trains the Trainers?

/I/D/E/A/ provides for the training of staff members of IGE schools through a process of teaching/learning clinical workshops. In the first step of the process, /I/D/E/A/ trains facilitators from intermediate agencies. (See p.37.)

Facilitators learn about IGE processes and about techniques to use in teaching staff members of IGE schools. /I/D/E/A/ cites several advantages to its clinical workshop approach:

- Facilitators are exposed to cognitive knowledge of the IGE process.
- Facilitators receive an opportunity to interact with other trainees. This interaction includes the give-and-take of constructive criticism by fellow learners.
- Facilitators learn how they can use the same clinical techniques when they move to the next step in the process--teaching staff members of IGE schools how to operate in IGE classes.

John Bahner, /I/D/E/A/’s director of innovative programs, says the institute carefully tailors and conducts the workshops so that facilitators can make maximum use of the training they receive. "We want [IGE facilitators] to be able to operate in their new role--IGE school personnel--in ways which are patterned identically to the way we operate with them," Bahner says. A description of a workshop follows:

During the 10-day clinic, facilitators become an actual teaching team in a school not yet using IGE processes. Team members must provide learning environments for students who attend for half of each day, as well as observe and analyze other facilitators as they work with students. During the second half of the day, facilitators conduct "critiquing sessions" (providing analysis and criticism of the morning's activities) with their colleagues. They learn more about IGE processes primarily by using IGE materials and through discussion groups with staff consultants. They also must plan for the next day's activities.

In addition to learning the role of IGE teachers and principals they learn their new role as an IGE facilitator in a separate three-day session. Thus, through movies, filmstrips, tapes and simulations, they learn how to answer questions on IGE from professionals and interested citizenry; they talk about ways of recruiting schools into League of Cooperating Schools which will implement IGE; they prepare plans for reactions by workshop consultants which they will use to recruit schools, hold the first league meeting and train principals and unit leaders.

Facilitators must have achieved all the outcomes designated for them prior to leaving the clinic, so in some cases this may be more or less than three days. "We anticipate a few facilitators may be around as long as five days during this period and other facilitators will need additional help in a school situation before they are deemed to have satisfactorily achieved all the outcomes," Bahner says.
Costs and Facilities

In any new program, the questions of how much it will cost and what kind of building arrangement will be needed always arise. And IGE is no different. The first staff cost that must be considered is the possibility of a higher rate of pay for unit leaders. The Wisconsin center recommends that unit leaders receive salaries 20% above those of staff teachers. In reality, unit leaders are receiving from 4% to 10% more than staff teachers. While the amount a district is prepared to spend is entirely up to the local district, the establishment of the new career position, that of the unit leader, calls for higher pay for the additional work and responsibility.

Another cost is for noncertified teaching aides. Some districts have used volunteer aides. Others use paid aides. By and large, most districts find that paid aides are more dependable, appear on a more regular basis and offer less confusion to the unit. One problem with volunteer aides is that they may only work one or two days a week.

The Wisconsin center suggests that a district planning to implement IGE should allocate at least $10 per pupil during the first two years for any combination of one instructional aide per 150 children, additional instructional materials and higher pay for the unit leader. Some districts report that this figure is too low, depending on the cost of aides, the kinds of materials the district is buying and other items. The $10 per-pupil cost per 150 students is generally low if an instructional aide is included. If a paid aide is added, the cost will generally double. Many districts have tried using parents on a volunteer basis but, in most cases, this has not worked out. It has saved some money, but many programs have suffered because parents generally are not able to serve on a regular basis. Other costs for staff development will include pay for teachers attending workshops, travel expenses to and from workshops, and so on. These staff development activities may be an addition to what the district had before starting multiunit schools.

An area of savings to school districts is reported by Norman Graper, principal of Wilson Elementary School in Janesville, Wis., one of the first multiunit schools in the nation. Graper says that hiring more aides and buying additional materials increased the school's operating costs, but that the increase was offset by savings gained by reducing the number of substitutes. When one member of a team was absent, other members of the team could fill in without any great loss of efficiency.

The cost of remodeling a school to provide the ideal space for IGE could be prohibitive. Therefore, the Wisconsin center recommends that as a minimum, walls of older buildings should be removed so that two well supplied instructional resource centers can be arranged, one to accommodate at least 90 intermediate-age children and another for at least 60 primary-age children. This creates most of the area needed for some large- and small-group instruction, one-to-one student-teacher instruction and independent study.

The Wisconsin center says that although there may be additional costs for a salary increase for the lead teacher, inservice training above current levels, facilities that may be outmoded, and aides not presently employed, it is extremely difficult to project exact increases for any given district.
HOW EFFECTIVE IS IGE?

Visits to IGE schools show there is no single set of IGE practices in operation. Even with the multiunit organization itself there are a number of variations in structure, policies and practices. A small percentage of the schools in their second year are not completely organized into units and continue partly in units and partly in age-graded classrooms. Also in some schools completely organized into units, the degree of implementation of the instructional programming model is diverse. Thus, some schools are effectively programming for the individual student in only one subject area, even after several years as IGE schools.

The degree of effectiveness seems to depend largely on the extent to which the various IGE components are implemented. The schools completely organized into units and also employing the instructional programming model in two or more curriculum areas are best able to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each child and can better use the skills and abilities of the unit staff to work in the various curriculum areas.

The importance of well functioning units and of strong principal leadership of the IIC is documented in a study of multiunit schools undertaken during the second semester of the 1967-68 school year. At that time the first multiunit schools were in their first year of operation and no instructional materials designed specifically for IGE were available from the Wisconsin center. Roland L. Pellegrin of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA) at the U. of Oregon carried out the study.

Six schools were included in this study—both a multiunit school and a control school in three different communities. Two reports resulted from the studies, one dealing with decision making and professional satisfaction and the other with organizational characteristics of the multiunit school.

Decision Making and Job Satisfaction

Overall, the study showed more participation by unit leaders and teachers in cooperative decision making about instruction and related matters in the three multiunit schools. In the control schools, decision making affecting classroom instruction was generally the prerogative of individual teachers, who were the primary decision makers, and the principal, who provided advice to individual teachers or set the limits within which individual teachers could make the decisions. In the multiunit schools, decisions were typically made by the unit staff in cooperation with the principal. Thus, whereas each teacher in the conventionally organized schools had more decision-making power
when it came to his own classroom, the multiunit teachers had greater responsibility for making policy decisions involving all the children of the respective units and also of the entire school building.

Job satisfaction and teacher morale were much higher in multiunit schools, the CASEA study found. Teachers were administered a 10-item job satisfaction scale. On three items, responses were similar for the two sets of schools. But there were significant differences on the other seven items, all in favor of the multiunit schools. These items and the percentages of teachers expressing high satisfaction follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Multiunit Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with progress towards one's personal goals in present position.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with personal relationships with administrators and supervisors.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to accept responsibility for one's own work or the work of others.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing positive results from one's efforts.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships with fellow teachers.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with present job in light of one's career expectations.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of pertinent instructional aids and materials.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CASEA team identified the following seven conditions which had a bearing on the high rate of satisfaction among multiunit teachers:

- The teacher is part of a group endeavor, rather than working in relative isolation. There are opportunities for close ties of cooperation among unit members.

- To a greater degree than in the control schools, teachers in the multiunit schools are able to concentrate on teaching, planning and preparing for instruction. Two reasons were given credit for this: (a) instructional and clerical aides, where they exist, relieve the teacher from routine work; and (b) nonteaching tasks performed by teachers in
traditional schools can be carried out by one person in a unit in the multiunit school.

- Teachers in multiunit schools see their environment as being freer, less rigid and more open to experimentation.

- Various forms of specialization are emerging in multiunit schools which make it possible for teachers to select duties according to their interests and talents and at the same time feel that they are heightening the effectiveness of the unit.

- An immediate resource person, the unit leader, is readily available to provide assistance, advice and consultation.

- The work environment of the multiunit school is new and may, for the short run, provide a positive influence on job satisfaction.

- Changes in the patterns of authority and decision making contribute to job satisfaction.

Organizational Characteristics

Pellegrin's study dealt both with interaction patterns in multiunit and control schools and also with the division of labor (specialization in the unit and the role of the unit leader). Following are highlights:

Interaction patterns. Consistently, these early multiunit schools were successful in encouraging cooperative activities. Within an I & R unit, there were close relationships involving joint decision making between teachers (other than unit leaders) and the principal. In the control schools, the individual teachers were more dependent on the principal, and there was considerably less interaction among the teachers. This varied somewhat, particularly when teachers at one grade level coordinated their activities.

Division of labor. By and large, when specialization is discussed on an elementary school level, it is usually thought of as either subject-matter specialization or departmentalization and is usually considered in a negative light. This is generally true of both teachers and principals. In the multiunit school, however, there is a certain degree of specialization.

CASEA found three conventional forms of specialization as well as some less conventional forms in the three schools studied. Conventional forms are:

- Specialization by subject-matter. That is, one teacher in the unit may be more skilled at teaching science while another may be more skilled in other subject areas.

- Specialization by grade level. This is particularly true in larger units, despite the abolition of grades.

- Specialization by ability groupings. Often, because of particular skills or teaching techniques, some teachers work with various children who
are grouped by ability. Grouping by intellectual ability is not recommended by either the Wisconsin center or I/D/E/A.

Of the unconventional forms of specialization, the study team found three main types:

- Some teachers devote most of their time to working with individual students, while others work mainly with small groups or class-sized units. In two of the schools studied, individualization and small-group instruction were heavily emphasized. In those schools, some teachers reported spending up to 75% of their time working with individual students. Other teachers reported spending up to the same amount of time with small groups. In summing up on this point, the study team reported: "In the light of the emphasis given to individual and small-group instruction in the multiunit system, the development of such specializations are to be anticipated. There are, however, disparities in the amount of such instruction from one unit to another within a school. One of the schools had retained class-sized groups almost exclusively. Individualized instruction in this school consisted almost entirely of routine drill by instructional aides."

- The second type of specialization emerging in the multiunit school was that of teachers serving as expert advisors to the other teachers in their unit. In the obvious case, the teacher serving as the expert had some special training in that area. At other times, the teacher who served as the expert may have been asked to take responsibility for learning about developments in a particular area and then keeping the other members of the unit informed. This kind of specialization was found to be "a highly promising development by the CASEA study team. It permits a type of accumulation and pooling of knowledge not possible under different circumstances."

- The third type of specialization found relates to special assignments. In several units studied by the CASEA team, teachers were given special responsibilities for planning units of instruction. In one unit, the teachers planned different phases of the instructional units and each took responsibility for one or more phases of the total process. Such assignments were often temporary. This type of division, the report said, "offers opportunities to get jobs done that could hardly be obtained in a more permanent and fixed division of labor."

Questions on Organization and Personnel

While the report itself stated that "it seems safe to say that the multiunit school holds high promise of ameliorating some of the endemic problems encountered in elementary schools," a number of questions were raised about the organizational structure and roles of personnel:

1. What is the relationship between unit size and unit effectiveness? The CASEA study found that in smaller units, the degree of interdependence between teachers and between teachers and the unit leader was greater than in the larger unit. In larger units (for example, in one
with a unit leader and eight teachers), there was a tendency to become segmented into subgroups based largely on the initial grade level of the children before organizing into units.

2. What are the functions of the IIC? Two of the three multiunit schools studied by CASEA in the spring of 1968 had an IIC. (All three had IICs in 1970-71 and thereafter.) In one of these two schools, the IIC functioned primarily as a vehicle for channeling news to teachers. In the other schools with an IIC more time was spent in discussing questions relating to instruction, but even so there were misunderstandings concerning the exact functions of the committee. Further, there was a problem of conflicting authority between the IIC and the individual units. The question of which decisions were to be the exclusive domain of the unit members and which were to be made for the entire school by the IIC was never clearly stated, according to the study report.

3. What is the role of the unit leader and what is the role of the principal? The CASEA study devoted considerable attention to the relationships of the unit leader and principal and the divisions of labor between them. Among the three multiunit schools, there was no general agreement concerning the roles which should be emphasized in these positions. Particularly variable were the instructional-leadership tasks handled by the unit leader. In many cases, unit leaders had assumed tasks which should have been handled by the principal, according to the Wisconsin center model. In addition, it was clear that the principal's instructional leadership role should be different in a multiunit school—he will carry out his leadership more with the unit leaders, less with individual staff teachers. Yet, what his role should be, particularly when a unit experienced difficulty, was hard to determine.

In fact, the role of the principal is so hard to determine that even the principals themselves have a hard time defining it. Many principals have found that their main duty becomes one of passing information to and from unit leaders and teachers and the central office.

Some principals, who were reluctant to give their names, say they have merely become high-priced errand boys and would like to return to a traditional school where they play more of a supervisory role. On the other hand, many principals report they have adjusted easily to working in the IGE system and enjoy the stimulation of using the new methods and systems to help children learn.

The Wisconsin center has since addressed a substantial research and development effort to solve these problems. Center recommendations concerning unit size are mentioned earlier in the discussion of "the organizational set-up"—that is, a unit leader, three to five teachers, an instructional aide, a clerical aide and up to 150 children.

The center's recommendations have come about through five years of working with multiunit schools. Visits to IGE schools and both earlier and later written reports, such as that by CASEA, have shown a variety in the organizational-administrative patterns. Some schools move quickly to several desired conditions—the whole school organized into smoothly functioning I & R units,
regularly scheduled and productive IIC meetings, instruction in two or more curriculum areas carried out according to the model of instructional programming for the individual student, and desirable home-school-community relations. Slowness in moving toward the model is related to conditions within school districts and school buildings and also to the availability of inservice staff development programs, of high quality curriculum material suited to IGE and of other desired working conditions. Both the Wisconsin center and /I/D/E/A/ report on these conditions through their annual evaluation efforts and have long-term commitments to come up with better solutions through continuing efforts with the schools.

Making Use of Recommendations

The Wisconsin center claims its most effective response to the schools' problems in implementing the new organizational-administrative arrangements has been to sharpen its inservice program, including the development of printed materials, slide films and IIC simulations. Also the center has established an implementation team of experienced multiunit building principals and unit leaders to conduct the initial inservice effort.

The center is currently engaged in nationwide implementation which was funded in March 1971 by a special grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The nationwide activities are carried out in a four-phase sequence:

- Awareness
- Installation
- Maintenance
- Refinement

In this effort the center implementation team works with implementation coordinators from various state education agencies and from central offices of large school districts. These coordinators in turn work with the staffs of local schools. Members of the implementation team also work with some of the staff of the local schools.

"Awareness" included information-giving conferences held throughout the country in 1971. The primary target group was building principals.

"First-year installation" includes four steps:

1. A one-day workshop for administrators and central office personnel is conducted the first time in a state or region by the Wisconsin center's staff and later by a state or local coordinator. The objective of the one-day workshop is to develop among state department and central office personnel an awareness of IGE. Chances for success at the building level are greater when a commitment has been made at the school district level. A second objective is to discuss and clarify the written agreement describing responsibilities and working arrangements between the center and implementation agencies as well as the written agreement describing responsibilities and working arrangements between the state implementation agency and the individual schools.

2. A three-day workshop for principals and prospective unit leaders is also initially conducted by the Wisconsin center staff. By the end of this workshop participants should be able to:
• Describe the organizational structure of the multiunit school.
• Identify the roles of the various personnel in the multiunit school.
• Explain the elements and processes of the instructional programming model.
• Outline the installation of the multiunit organization and IGE in their building.
• Describe the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development—its elements and their functions.
• Conduct inservice programs for their entire building staff.

3. A three- to five-day workshop for the entire staff of each building is conducted prior to the opening of school by school personnel from the two workshops described above. Assistance from the center to only a few districts is possible since these workshops come mostly in August.

4. Four half-day inservice sessions for the entire building staff are conducted by implementation agency personnel with assistance as possible during the first year by the center's implementation team.

"Maintenance" includes one-week institutes on college campuses for experienced multiunit personnel. The Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction has demonstrated that multiunit schools can begin operating and survive reasonably well for a year or two with the amount of assistance described earlier. However, field testing by the Wisconsin center staff in 1970-71 showed that many multiunit personnel had not fully acquired mastery of the concepts and were deficient in key skills. To remedy this situation, the Wisconsin center and cooperating teacher education institutions outlined one-week institutes for experienced multiunit principals, unit leaders and staff reading teachers. The one-week institutes for staff teachers of math, science and other curriculum areas will be added as the center develops programs in these areas. The focus of these institutes is to meet the immediate needs of the practicing staff members of multiunit schools.

"Refinement-Institutionalization" includes academic year programs with a practicum for multiunit school personnel—particularly the building principals and unit leader—a master's degree and a post-master's specialist certificate. This program was funded by USOE for only one year but three institutions will probably continue the programs without further USOE support.

Through the preceding implementation strategy, multiunit personnel are being more adequately prepared for their new roles than they were when the CASEA study was conducted in 1968. The Wisconsin center says many of the questions raised by the report concerning organization and roles of personnel have been dealt with in this four-phase installation sequence. It assures initial inservice training for local school staffs as well as continuing assistance from the state education agency and teacher education institutions. Further, the lead teacher role is beginning to be a career position that attracts key instructional personnel who assume much responsibility for planning educational experiences for children and on-the-job education for the unit staff. The building principal's role is also enhanced—he assumes greater initiative for instructional improvement and for better communication with personnel. The environment produced by these personnel in the multiunit setting should encourage self-renewal of the staff and related continuously changing and improved education for children.
WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The growth of IGE schools across the country testifies to the acceptance of the concept by teachers, school administrators, parents and children. In the 1972-73 school year it is estimated that there will be more than 350 new schools working with the Wisconsin center and approximately 200 working with I/D/E/A/. This will bring the total number of multiunit schools to well above 1,000. Many more schools have expressed an interest in IGE, say proponents, but they do not have the resources required to offer support services to an IGE network. "We can't add days to the calendar and we can't make up the money to hire new staff we'd need to expand the network," says Elaine McGregor, coordinator of statewide networks at the Wisconsin center.

Why the growing interest? School administrators give varying answers based on their own observations; the Wisconsin center cites data from formal studies which supports these practitioners' statements.

IGE Expansion

Take for example the case of Des Moines, Iowa. Through the 1971-72 school year, Des Moines had five elementary schools that had converted to the multiunit model. Eight additional schools converted to the IGE system in the fall of 1972. Why? An answer is offered by James E. Bowman, director of elementary education in Des Moines: "The feedback we have received from teachers, parents and students in the five schools currently using the IGE program has indicated exceptional acceptance of the program and significant academic achievement. We feel confident that this program will be well received by the new schools and we look for excellent academic achievement in those schools in this program."

These comments can be repeated for school systems across the country that have switched to the IGE system. In Xenia, Ohio, William M. Hill, assistant superintendent of schools, says the attitudes of teachers have changed enormously. "We've got better teaching than we ever had before," Hill said. Lawrence D. Morgan of the Oregon City, Ohio, school district, cites team planning that has made the concept truly workable. "It's amazing the creativity that develops. It forces research. Our discipline has improved, and we have found that home-community liaisons have improved."

In Janesville, Wis., community response to the multiunit school has been extremely positive. Wilson Elementary School was one of the first multiunit schools started by the Wisconsin center. Since 1969, ten other Janesville schools have adopted this approach, and parents are demanding more. At a
school board meeting, one parent whose children were not in multiunit schools was quoted as saying, "I'm afraid we are the have-nots and we'd rather be the haves." Another parent said he was "completely sold" on the multiunit concept. "It's great. I've seen such a change in my children. I hope all the schools can be this way. My neighbors are sold, too." Norman Graper, principal of the Wilson School, sums up the reasons for increased interest this way: "I think that primarily the children have a better self-image and understanding of what the school is trying to do for them. I think if the child feels good about himself and is learning, that's what sells the program."

Data from Current Studies

Recent data support the contention that a child's self-concept as a learner is better in a multiunit than in a traditionally organized school. The study, "An Analysis of the Relationships of the Multiunit School Organizational Structure and Individually Guided Education to the Learning Climate of Pupils," was conducted in 1971-72 by Richard G. Nelson, a 1972 doctoral candidate at the U. of Wisconsin. (It is being published by the Wisconsin center as Technical Report No. 213.)

Nelson investigated the relationship of the multiunit organization to the learning climate of students. Learning climate was defined as "a combination of the behavioral and attitudinal variables in a pupil's immediate school setting which may affect learning." The variables included factors related to school morale and the student's self-concept as a learner.

The sample used in the study included 25 schools--13 multiunit and 12 control schools. The multiunit schools were selected based on the following criteria: the school must be fully organized in the multiunit pattern, must be in at least its second year of operation and must include students in the 9-12 age range (upper unit). The self-contained control schools were matched on the criteria of geographic location, size and socioeconomic background.

The instruments chosen for gathering data on learning climate included the school morale scale and the "semantic differential of self-concept as a learner." These instruments were combined and modified for use in the study as indicated by a pilot test conducted in one multiunit school and one control school, exclusive of the study's sample. Attendance and tardiness data were also collected using the total enrollment of each school in the sample.

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn with respect to multiunit schools:

1. Pupils in multiunit schools exhibited more positive learning attitudes than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

2. Pupils in multiunit schools generally appeared to have a more positive self-concept as learners than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

3. Pupils in multiunit schools displayed a more positive attitude toward their fellow pupils than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.
4. There was no difference between multiunit pupils and pupils in traditionally organized schools with respect to their attitude toward teachers.

5. Pupils in multiunit schools generally appeared to have a more positive attitude toward instruction than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

6. Pupils in multiunit schools revealed a more positive attitude toward school in general (school morale) than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

7. Pupils in multiunit schools had a more positive attitude toward their school plant than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

8. There was no difference between multiunit pupils and pupils in traditionally organized schools with respect to their attitude toward administration and staff.

9. Pupils in multiunit schools exhibited a more positive attitude toward their community than did pupils in traditionally organized schools.

10. There was no difference between multiunit school pupils and pupils in traditionally organized schools with respect to their records of attendance and tardiness.

The study cites the following implications of its findings: "Those educators, whether they be school board members, administrators or classroom teachers who include in their list of educational objectives a concern with the attitudes of their pupils should welcome evidence that the school environment can make a difference in these areas." It does caution, however, that adoption of the IGE system "does not, in itself, guarantee an improved learning climate." Analysis of individual school pairs did show that in two districts, pupils in control schools scored higher on several items than did pupils in multiunit schools. The study points out that there are other factors which affect the learning climate (such as teacher personality or the student's home situation).

What Makes IGE Work?

The implementation staff from the Wisconsin center believes that in order for the multiunit organization to show positive results it is not only necessary to be fully organized into units, including a functioning ITC, but it is also essential to be employing the instructional programming model (figure 3, p.8) in at least one curriculum area during the first year and in two or more areas thereafter. After all, the multiunit structure is only one component (that is, the organizational-administrative component) of IGE.

Curriculum materials, related statements of instructional objectives and criterion-referenced tests which can be adopted or adapted by schools are needed. The Wisconsin center is developing materials and instructional procedures in reading, prereading, motivation and mathematics. Parts of two of these programs—reading and motivation—are widely available in precommercial
versions for the 1972-73 school year. Field test results on both programs are encouraging.

Wisconsin's Reading Program

The "Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development" links essential reading skills with related behavioral objectives and provides machine-scorable, criterion-referenced tests for assessing children's mastery of these skills from kindergarten to sixth grade. Resource materials and management procedures for teachers help them organize programs for individual children. The reading design program is organized into four areas: word attack; study skills; comprehension; and self-directed reading, interpretive reading and creative reading skills.

In the 1970-71 school year, the center began a two-year evaluation of the word attack element of the "Design." Data gathered in 23 schools chosen for intensive study provide an interesting commentary on the effectiveness of the reading program and on practices related to its implementation. The study was designed to represent a variety of community settings, reading achievement levels and school structures.

Pupil performance was evaluated with respect to the 45 word attack objectives. Specifically, performance of children who had experienced the word attack program for six months was compared to performance of non-participating pupils of the same age/grade characteristics in the same school one year earlier. In addition, standardized measures of performance on skills similar to those specified in the word attack element were applied and comparisons made between results for children who had participated in the program and those who had not.

Not surprisingly, the strongest effect of the program was revealed in the tests associated with the 45 word attack objectives. On more than 90% of the objectives, achievement of children with six months of word attack instruction was higher than that of children who had not participated in the program. This finding pertained to all subcategories of schools, including inner city and multiunit schools, as well as to the total number of schools.

Confirmation of improvement in the general area of word attack skills was provided by administering appropriate subtests of the Cooperative Primary and Stanford Achievement Test Batteries. In all instances, children who had participated in the word attack program scored as well as or better than children who had not had the design on measures of word analysis. In some of the inner city schools, dramatic gains were observed in the Cooperative Primary Phonics Analysis Test.

Since 11 of the field test schools were organized in conventional age-graded, self-contained classrooms, it was possible to look at the effect of introducing an IGE-oriented instructional program on a non-IGE organization.

The most encouraging result was that all schools reported cooperative planning and exchanging of pupils among teachers working at the same grade levels. Principals interviewed were enthusiastic about increased staff inter-
action, improved communication within the school, and better utilization of reading specialists which the design encouraged. Two of the self-contained schools elected to go multiunit at the end of the first field test year, and four other principals reported they were considering changing over in two years.

Wisconsin's Motivation Program

The other instructional program developed by the Wisconsin center is Individually Guided Motivation (IGM)--a system of school motivation with a related inservice program for teachers. It calls for a cooperative effort in identifying general motivational objectives for all children in the school and then planning and carrying out motivational-instructional procedures based on each child's present level of motivation, achievement and self-direction. This program is being widely distributed by the Wisconsin center on a precommercial basis in 1972-73 and will be commercially available beginning in 1973. It was developed according to the center's model of instructional programming for the individual student (see figure 3, p.8) and has undergone extensive field testing.

Four motivational-instructional procedures provide the main means for aiding children who are low in motivation, achievement or self-direction:

- Teacher-child goal-setting conferences related to subject matter learning.
- Adult-child conferences to promote independent reading.
- Small-group conferences to encourage self-directed prosocial behaviors.
- Guiding older students as tutors of younger students.

Evaluations of the first three procedures and related inservice programs and materials in a number of Wisconsin schools indicate significant increases in student motivation and achievement accrue from using IGM procedures.

Three groups of students—totaling about 50 children—in three different Wisconsin schools made positive and at times dramatic gains in achievement while participating in the goal-setting conferences. Each group was made up of students whose rate of progress was very slow in a given skill area—math, word attack skills and sight vocabulary. Following a two-month period of individual goal-setting conferences, definite improvement was recorded for all three groups compared to a base period prior to the test. In all three, students' rate of progress after conferences ended remained high compared to the period before testing began.

In a field test of individual conferences to promote independent reading in 1970-71, the 65 adults who had conferences with 360 children reported large increases in the number of books the children read independently. In addition, grade equivalent gains on standardized tests of one year or more were observed for comprehension in grade 4 and reading speed in grade 6.

A small-scale evaluation of the small-group conferences to encourage self-directed prosocial behaviors was carried out during the 1971-72 school year. Early results are that children modified their behaviors to meet the goals which they set for themselves with teacher guidance. An important side effect of the conferences was increased communication and interaction.
between students and teachers. A number of schools using the program found out more about their students' attitudes and other individual characteristics.

Officials of the Wisconsin center say the results obtained through use of the reading and motivation programs indicate the desirable effects of a concerted attack on curriculum improvement as proposed by a model of instructional programming for the individual student. They say that: the multiunit organization brings increased professional satisfaction among staff members and provides the flexibility necessary for scheduling instruction for the individual student; instructional materials and procedures designed specifically for individualizing instruction provide the means whereby a child can actually work at his own rate, in his own style, according to his own needs.

What's IGE's Future?

What's ahead for tomorrow and the near future? There are already a few middle schools listed among IGE schools. And IGE specialists predict that in the next two to three years, IGE is going to expand into the secondary domain and that the number of middle schools, junior high schools and senior high schools will add appreciably to the list of operating multiunit schools. The Wisconsin center has developed an IGE model for secondary schools that will undergo pilot testing in a few schools during 1972-73. Administrators at the center say it takes at least three years from the formulation of a model through testing it in a variety of settings, and developing and testing a related inservice program. Until the inservice program is available and the costs for the new practices are competitive with existing practices, the center does not attempt to implement on a wide scale.

/I/D/E/A/ is also moving toward an IGE high school model. Its staff members foresee interdisciplinary learning units consisting of from six to nine teachers at the high school level and 10 to 12 teachers at the middle or junior high school level. The model-sized unit for an elementary school by comparison, is from three to five teachers. The basic elements of the secondary model would be the same as those in the elementary model, and /I/D/E/A/ set December 1972 as the target date for completion of its inservice program and materials for the middle and junior high models and December 1973 for completion of the high school model.

Under the /I/D/E/A/ setup, elementary school IGE would cover children aged 5 to 12; middle and junior high school IGE would serve students aged 10 to 15; and high school IGE would serve students 14 to 19. The /I/D/E/A/ concept of leagues to provide inter-unit linkages would be continued with separate leagues for elementary schools; separate leagues for middle, junior high and senior high schools; and combined leagues of elementary and middle schools.

/I/D/E/A/ and the Wisconsin center predict that their continued refinement and expansion of IGE will establish the IGE system as an accepted practice in America's schools for quite some time ahead. They say all education indicators point to continuing and growing interest in providing individualization of instruction for children. They see IGE as an opportunity for teachers to provide this individualized service within a structure which gives them freedom to try different approaches while at the same time provid-
ing them with assistance and consultation and the support of other teachers who are also working with IGE.

Perhaps the success of the IGE system, its proponents say, is not that it is a highly organized program in the sense that it sets up all the steps for teachers and students, but that it is an umbrella structure that provides a format for trying all kinds of different teaching methods, techniques and strategies with one basic idea in mind—giving each child the opportunity to learn with materials that are most suited to him and in a situation that is most suitable to his style of learning.

IGE proponents also point out that the IGE system with its models for organization and instruction is far more appealing to many teachers than the seemingly free "open classroom" because it offers the same kind of freedom to teachers and children and allows them to work in the atmosphere that is most suitable for both.

Where To Go for More Information

For further information on any aspect of Individually Guided Education, contact the following:

- Dr. Kenneth M. Schultz
  Innovative Programs
  Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc.
  5335 Far Hills Ave.
  Suite 300
  Dayton, Ohio 45429

  Phone: 513-434-7300

OR

- Miss Mary S. Horn
  Assistant to the Deputy Director
  Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning
  1025 W. Johnson St.
  Madison, Wis. 53706

  Phone: 608-262-4901

OR

- One of the /I/D/E/A/ Intermediate Agencies (listed on p.37-39)
- One of the Wisconsin center's State Coordinators (listed on p.40)
WORDS TO THE WISE

If there is any concrete advice that IGE participants feel should be offered to new school districts going into the IGE system, it is this: "Be sure that the people involved (that is, teachers, unit leaders and principals) know exactly what is entailed in the multiunit school program."

This advice was repeated by a number of school superintendents, principals, teachers and unit leaders. Roughly 90% of those interviewed stressed the importance of thorough teacher training and preparation. Some of the teachers interviewed made this additional comment: "If we aren't fully prepared and knowledgeable about what is involved in IGE, the program is going to flop. No matter how enthusiastic we are about the concept, putting it into operation requires complete understanding by all involved."

John Levigne, superintendent of schools in River Edge, N.J., added a few other comments: "Don't label the program. If you can upgrade logically and successfully, do it. Don't publicize it." When the plan was first broached at a public meeting in River Edge during the fall of 1971, Levigne added, a number of questions were raised that were difficult to answer to everyone's satisfaction.

"We have a K-6 school system, and our secondary school students go to a regional junior-senior high school district. One of the big concerns was, 'If you educate children under these new types of approaches, how will they fit into the junior high school setup?' Of course we explained that the junior high school staff was aware of what we were trying to do, and they knew they might have to make some adjustments for our children," Levigne explained.

"Then, of course, we got the standard question, 'We have a good school system, why change it?' How can you answer that question? We tried to tell people that no matter how good a school system is, if something worthwhile comes along, it is to the benefit of the students to try it. Who knows, it might make our good schools better."

In River Edge, IGE will be instituted in three schools. One school, with a K-4 enrollment, will be completely multiunit except for the kindergarten. The other two consist of grades 4-6 and in each school there will be an intermediate 4-5-6 unit. In New Jersey, the state education department selected 25 districts to participate in its program, which concentrated on training teachers and unit leaders to make them thoroughly familiar with the program.

Of 55 teachers and specialists in the River Edge system, 20 teachers wanted to take part in the multiunit plan. Of these, 12 classroom teachers...
and two reading specialists were selected for the IGE system. For most of
the teachers, the changes were drastic. "We were tired of going it alone," a
number of them said. "We wanted a chance to work together professionally
and really put into practice a lot of the ideas we had heard about." "This
is really the emancipation of the classroom teacher," another teacher said.
"No longer are we isolated within four walls and 25 children. Now we have a
chance to really try teaching according to the way we learned."

Levigne and the staff feel strongly about IGE. "We want to promote the
program. For the first time, we have an overall means to pull together the
innovations of the past 20 years. And, despite what the critics say, the
children will not be hurt. How can they be hurt when you offer them a vari-
ety of teaching situations and a variety of teachers. But the key to the
whole program is enthusiastic teachers who are fully informed and feel cap-
able of handling any situation."

In Livingston, N.J., Herbert Andlauer, the director of curriculum, also
feels strongly about IGE and the multiunit school. "For the first time, we
are putting into practice many of the concepts to which we have given lip
service for many years. When you talk about individualized instruction, team
teaching, individual assessments, you are talking about innovative ideas that
have been around for a number of years. When you talk about the multiunit
school, you talk about an umbrella program that permits the practical appli-
cation of these and other innovations that have never really made it into
the schools on a large scale."

Of Livingston's 3,875 students in grades K-6, about 520 in one of its
schools were using the IGE system in math in the fall of 1972. "We felt that
it would be easier and more proper to train our teachers to work more compe-
tently in one area at first. Later, of course, IGE will be expanded to in-
clude other subject areas."

The principal of Livingston's Callins School is deeply involved in the
program. Of him, Andlauer said, "He was way ahead of it. Even before we
ever heard of IGE or the multiunit school, he was trying to implement some of
the elements that are part of IGE. As soon as there was a possibility of a
state grant to work on IGE, he was all for it."

The principal, Leonard Bernstein, believes in IGE and the opportunities
it offers to individualize instruction for each child. "Any one who says
that you can teach the same thing to 25 youngsters and expect them to learn
at the same rate and with the same degree of comprehension, doesn't know very
much about children. IGE gives us the opportunity to devise individual teach-
ing strategies for each youngsters. For those who learn better in lecture type
situations, there will be large-group instruction. For those who work better
with one or two other children and a teacher, there is very small group in-
struction. We can provide different instructional settings, different kinds
of materials and different teachers. You just can't do this in the tradi-
tional self-contained classroom," Bernstein said.

One problem the school district faced was the local education associa-
tion. "The association was leery at first," Andlauer explained, "but the
staff at Callins was totally enthusiastic. Their enthusiasm spread and now
we have another school that wants to get involved in IGE. Of our eight schools, some six have expressed varying degrees of interest.

"Two points of advice that I would offer school districts planning to start with IGE: work through your teachers. You cannot issue a proclamation or orders saying that a school will become an IGE school," Andlauer added. "The staff has to be the forcing agent. Make sure it's something the staff wants, only then can you commit the district. Second, make sure your teachers are thoroughly trained. No matter how enthusiastic the teachers are, they have to know what is expected of them. There is a lot of work involved on their part and if they aren't prepared for it, the whole thing will fall apart."

Livingston teachers are presently involved in weekly training sessions, and unit leaders are attending regional seminars, bringing back information and then passing it on to the staff. Twenty teachers are involved, and so far their enthusiasm has not diminished. "It's a lot of work," said one teacher. "There are so many things to keep in mind. And you really have to get to know the children. But it is satisfying to work with a group of teachers who are really professional. That, and the knowledge that you are going to make the education of each child individual and personally relevant, makes all the work worthwhile."

Another teacher agreed and then added: "You know, we talk about individualizing instruction for youngsters. I guess to some degree I did some individualizing within my own classroom. But to be able to offer each child different kinds of learning chances, with a teacher who might be more compatible, and with materials that might be closer to that child's mark, that's really individualizing. And that is great."

Cassadaga Valley Central School District in New York is somewhat different from the two New Jersey school districts. Cassadaga Valley has four IGE multiunit schools at the elementary level. Two of the schools have been multiunit schools since 1968, so the experience and advice from school officials, teachers and principals there perhaps carry more weight. Frederick Wilson, redesign coordinator for the school district, gives this advice: "Be sure that everyone--principals, unit leaders and teachers, especially the teachers—who are involved in the multiunit school knows exactly what the multiunit school operation entails. Unless the staff and everyone connected with any new system in the school knows the complete works, there will be problems. This is especially true for IGE because it really forces drastic changes in school organization and operation."

Successful implementation of IGE in Cassadaga is testified to by the two additional schools now in the program and the spread of the program to another school district in the same county in western New York. The four schools in Cassadaga serve about 800 students, almost the entire elementary school enrollment. When the multiunit school was initially organized, all subject areas were covered. "We felt that it was the best way to go. We just made sure that our teachers were well prepared for the setup."

Wilson cites two possible areas of concern in initiating the IGE system: teachers and parents. "We were extremely fortunate. The teachers in our
system were ready, willing and able to adapt to the IGE system. They were interested and involved in it right from the start. Without their initial interest in IGE and the multiunit school, we would never have gotten the program off the ground. Also, since we do have excellent school-community relations, there was no problem in getting parental acceptance of the program."

Wilson strongly recommended that principals be given a major role in setting up the program, training the teachers and developing the learning units.

Teachers in Cassadaga strongly recommend IGE. One teacher observed: "There's no other way to go. In the self-contained classroom all I did was give lip service to the great ideals of individualized instruction and a lot of other ideas for improving education. It was just impossible to keep up with everything. Now, I not only have time to teach the way any involved teacher wants to, but I also have the time to see if I'm hitting the mark. With the constant evaluation of the children, I can tell almost immediately who needs help. And with the other teachers in the unit, we can work out the best learning program for each child. I'm learning all the time. From those teachers who have better techniques for reaching certain children, I'm learning how to do my job better. I feel that there's no better educational setup for both the children and the teachers."

Other teachers, too, expressed similar feelings. "It's amazing how good I feel when I see a youngster get the understanding of an idea or concept and to know that the school and the teachers are really working for the child. For too long, schools were school centered. New programs would come along and we'd grab them because there were federal or state moneys attached. This is something the local district is operating, and even more directly, it's really school organized, not district controlled. It's the best thing I've run across in my years of teaching."

Despite the limited sample, there's no doubt that once teachers, unit leaders and principals get into the IGE system, they really become enthusiastic about the possibilities it offers them and the children. However, as most of them say, if you're not prepared, you can't do the job right.
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<td>601: 948-4794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Mr. Norvell Burkett or Mr. Bart MacNeill</td>
<td>Mississippi Educational Services Center, Drawer NX, State College, Miss. 39762</td>
<td>601: 325-3917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Mr. Clarence Lynn</td>
<td>New Careers in Education, New Jersey State Dept. of Education, 1000 Spruce St., Trenton, N.J. 08625</td>
<td>609: 292-7109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Mr. Wayne A. Winterton</td>
<td>Albuquerque Area - BIA, Box 8327, Albuquerque, N.M. 87108</td>
<td>505: 843-3160 (3161, 3162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Miss Jane Sheckells</td>
<td>Syracuse City School District, 409 W. Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13202</td>
<td>315: 474-6031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Miss Doris Hutchinson</td>
<td>Greensboro Public Schools, Drawer V, Greensboro, N.C. 27402</td>
<td>919: 275-8281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Dr. Donald K. Lemon</td>
<td>College of Education U. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D. 58201</td>
<td>701: 777-2674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mr. Donald Peters</td>
<td>Ashtabula County Schools Jefferson, Ohio 44047</td>
<td>216: 576-3881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Mr. Floyd Edwards</td>
<td>East Tennessee State U. Dept. of Education Johnson City, Tenn. 37601</td>
<td>615: 926-1112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas
Dr. Henrietta Grooms
or Mr. Von Rhea Beane
Region VII Education Service Center
PO Box 1622
Kilgore, Texas 75662
214: 984-8907

Mr. Donroy Hafner
Director of Instructional Services
Region XIII Education Service Center
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Tex. 78721
512: 926-8080

Mr. Bill Brandon
or Mr. Roberto Vela
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
800 Brazos St.
Austin, Tex. 78701
512: 476-6861

Texas (Cont.)
Dr. Lee Ellwood
Texas Educational Renewal Center
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Tex. 78721
512: 926-8080

Virginia
Mr. Oliver Pamplin
County of Albemarle
Dept. of Education
Room 310, County Office Building
Charlottesville, Va. 22901
703: 296-5621

Dr. Raymond A. O'Neill
Arlington Public Schools
1426 N. Quincy St.
Arlington, Va. 22207
703: 558-2843

Virginia (Cont.)
Mr. Ed Warehime
Project PLACE
Lynchburg Public Schools
11th and Court Sts.
Lynchburg, Va. 24504
703: 847-1214

Washington
Mr. Dave Zeigler
Bureau of School Service and Research
U. of Washington
Seattle, Wash. 98105
206: 543-4940

Wisconsin
Mr. George Glasrud
Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction
126 Langdon St.
Madison, Wis. 53702
608: 266-2542
WISCONSIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
State Coordinators and Contact Persons

California
Mr. David Rawnsley
555 Veterans Blvd.
Room 118
Red Wood City, Calif. 94063
415: 364-4428

Dr. Warren Kallenbach
San Jose State College
125 S. 7th St.
San Jose, Calif. 95114
408: 277-2672

Colorado
Mr. James C. Hixson
Senior Consultant (IGE)
or Mr. Ronald Horn
Consultant
Improved Learning Unit
Colorado Dept. of Education
Colfax and Sherman Aves.
Denver, Colo. 80203
303: 892-3382

Connecticut
Mr. Walter E. Krupa
IGE Coordinator
Dept. of Education
U. of Hartford
200 Bloomfield Ave.
West Hartford, Conn. 06117
203: 523-4811

Mr. Michael F. Tobin
Elementary School Consultant
Conn. State Dept. of Education
PO Box 2219
Hartford, Conn. 06115
203: 566-5808

Mrs. Louise Wickware
Instructional Supervisor
State Dept. of Education
948 Main St.
Willimantic, Conn. 06226
203: 423-9571

Illinois
Mrs. Eleanor Buehrig
Assistant Director
Curriculum Development
and Services Unit
or Mr. Mason Rhue
Consultant

Illinois (Cont.)
or Mr. Chalmar Moore
Consultant
Office of Superintendent of
Public Instruction
316 S. Second St.
Springfield, Ill. 62706
217: 525-3594

Indiana
Mr. Terry Jackson
Coordinator - IGE/MUS-E
ESEA Title III
State Office Building
Office No. 703
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204
317: 633-4355

Massachusetts
Mr. Les Bernal
or Mr. Richard Lavin
Merrimack Center
101 Mill St.
Chelmsford, Mass. 01824
617: 256-3985

Minnesota
Mr. Richard Mesenburg
Consultant IGE/MUS-E
Dept. of Education
Division of Instruction
653 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul Minn. 55101
612: 296-3301

New Jersey
Dr. Anthony E. Conte
Director, New Careers
in Education
or Dr. Clarence Lynn
Program Coordinator
Office of Program
Development
New Jersey State Dept.
of Education
1000 Spruce St.
Trenton, N.J. 08625
609: 292-7109

New York
Mr. Ronald E. Hull
Teacher Education Research
Center
State University College
Fredonia, N.Y. 14063
716: 673-3219

Ohio
Mr. C. William Phillips
or Mr. Robert Weinfurtner
Consultant
Ohio Dept. of Education
781 Northwest Blvd.
Columbus, Ohio 43212
614: 469-2979

South Carolina
Mrs. Bobbie McEntire
IGE Facilitator
State Dept. of Education
803 Rutledge Building
Columbia, S.C. 29201
803: 758-3394

Wisconsin
Dr. Barbara Thompson
Consultant
Wisconsin Dept. of Public
Instruction
126 Langdon St.
Madison, Wis. 53702
608: 266-2342

Virginia
Mrs. Irene Lober
Franklin Sherman
Elementary School
6630 Brawner St.
McLean, Va. 22101
703: 356-3874 / 356-6464
IGE/Multiunit Schools with Relationships with the Wisconsin Center

CALIFORNIA

BELMONT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Claude C. Turner, Supt.
Central School
Charles Warda, principal
525 Middle Road
Belmont, Calif. 94002

HILLSBOROUGH CITY SCHOOLS
Dr. Tod A. Anton, Supt.
South School
Mrs. Barbara Bandy, principal
303 El Cerrito Ave.
Hillsborough, Calif. 94010

NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOLS
Dr. Donald Thomas, Supt.
Milani School
Leo J. Hinkel, principal
P.O. Box 385
Newark, Calif. 94560

OAKLAND CITY SCHOOLS
Marcus A. Foster, Supt.
Martin Luther King, Jr., School
Mrs. Minnie B. West, principal
960 Tenth St.
Oakland, Calif. 94607

RAVENSWOOD CITY SCHOOLS
John A. Minor, Supt.
Belle Haven School
Willie C. Richardson, principal
415 Ivy Drive
Menlo Park, Calif. 94025

COLORADO

ADAMS COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Daniel B. Stukey, Supt.
D. B. Stukey Elementary
Cale G. Johnson, principal
11080 Grant Drive
Northglenn, Colo. 80233

ADAMS-ARAPAHOE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Urban J. D. Leavitt, Supt.
Altura Boulevard Elementary
John Dale, principal
1650 Altura Ave.
Aurora, Colo. 80010

CHERRY CREEK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Edward C. Pino, Supt.
Greenwood
Richard J. Morton, principal
5550 South Holly St.
Littleton, Colo. 80121

CLEAR CREEK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Robert Metzler, Supt.
Georgetown-Empire Elementary
Earl Kennedy, Director of Learning
Georgetown, Colo. 80444

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Howard L. Johnson, Supt.
Cheltenham Elementary School
Mrs. Virginia O. Hansen, principal
150 Julian St.
Denver, Colo. 80204

ENGLEWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Donald Harpe, Supt.
Maddox Elementary School
Arthur E. Harding, principal
700 West Mansfield Ave.
Englewood, Colo. 80110

HARRISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Wayne Bricker, Supt.
Pikes Peak Elementary School
Larry R. Faubion, principal
1520 Verde Drive
Colorado Springs, Colo. 80910

JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Alton W. Cowan, Supt.
Bear Creek Elementary
William N. Thompson, principal
3125 South Kipling St.
Morris, Colo. 80465

JEFFERSON'S CREEK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Lawrence Schrader, principal
R.R. 1—Box 352
Evergreen, Colo. 80439
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Principal Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Gables Elementary</td>
<td>Charles E. Teal</td>
<td>8701 West Woodard Drive Lakewood, Colo. 80226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Mountain Elementary</td>
<td>William Boland</td>
<td>12250 West Kentucky Drive Lakewood, Colo. 80228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juchem Elementary School</td>
<td>Robert A. Morton</td>
<td>9955 Yukon St. Broomfield, Colo. 80020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Elementary School</td>
<td>Elmer L. Richers</td>
<td>6750 South Kendall Blvd. Littleton, Colo. 80020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA VETA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Eugene J. Coburn</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Veta Elementary School</td>
<td>Donald Johnson</td>
<td>P.O. Box 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS NO. 1</td>
<td>Frank Maher, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte Canyon Elementary</td>
<td>Rodney L. Pekarek</td>
<td>Box 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POUDRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Don Webber, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Elementary School</td>
<td>B. Keith Johnson</td>
<td>330 East Laurel St. Fort Collins, Colo. 80521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riffenburgh Elementary School</td>
<td>Robert D. Asmus</td>
<td>1320 East Stuart St. Fort Collins, Colo. 80521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUEBLO CITY SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Lee L. Williamson</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Elementary</td>
<td>Myron Roberts, principal</td>
<td>6th and Fountain Sts. Pueblo, Colo. 80101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Goodnight Elementary</td>
<td>Dick Elm, principal</td>
<td>4701 Sage St. Pueblo, Colo. 80105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga A. Hellbeck Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Marion A. Chanick, principal</td>
<td>3400 Lakeview St. Pueblo, Colo. 80105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Elementary School</td>
<td>Edward Lane, principal</td>
<td>21st and Hallett Sts. Pueblo, Colo. 80103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School</td>
<td>Stephen Hiza, principal</td>
<td>Prairie and Thatcher Aves. Pueblo, Colo. 80105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUEBLO COUNTY SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Harry A. Allen, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale Elementary School</td>
<td>Dr. C. Thomas Pollard, principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 247 Avondale, Colo. 80122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Elementary School</td>
<td>Donald Gaylord, principal</td>
<td>Route 1—Box 444 Pueblo, Colo. 80104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKY FORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Leo F. Davey, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Elementary School</td>
<td>Ronald Fink, principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 311 Rocky Ford, Colo. 81067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Primary School</td>
<td>Mrs. Barbara Evans, principal</td>
<td>Box 311 Rocky Ford, Colo. 81067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ROUTT PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>William L. Meek, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Routt Elementary School</td>
<td>Oliver Phillips, principal</td>
<td>Box 97 Yampa, Colo. 80483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Dr. Claude Stansberry, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Thompson Elementary</td>
<td>Mansel Worden, principal</td>
<td>Star Route Box 400 Loveland, Colo. 80537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALSENBURG PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Rev. Maurice Gallagher, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>Sister Naomi Rosenberger, principal</td>
<td>Seventh and Russell Sts. Walsenburg, Colo. 81089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Dr. Kenneth Ripple, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Winifred Getman, principal</td>
<td>9th Ave.—23rd St. Greeley, Colo. 80631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood Elementary</td>
<td>Larry D. Charles, principal</td>
<td>26th and 25th Aves. Greeley, Colo. 80631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Catherine Rife, principal</td>
<td>1424 13th Ave. Greeley, Colo. 80631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappelow East Elementary</td>
<td>Paul Rutherford, principal</td>
<td>9th and Golden Sts. P.O. Box 9 Evans, Colo. 80620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappelow West Elementary</td>
<td>Paul Rutherford, principal</td>
<td>9th St. and 11th Ave. Evans, Colo. 80620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA VETA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Eugene J. Coburn, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal Elementary School</td>
<td>Frank Sass, principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 427 Platteville, Colo. 80511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Elementary</td>
<td>Dr. Cecil A. Matthews, principal</td>
<td>29th Ave. and 13th St. Greeley, Colo. 80631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELD COUNTY REORGANIZED SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-1</td>
<td>Art Watson, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVON PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Dr. Herbert F. Pandiscio, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towpath Elementary</td>
<td>Paul G. Gionfriddo, principal</td>
<td>50 Simsbury Road Avon, Conn. 06001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOOMFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Dr. Herbert Chester, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Middle School</td>
<td>Harold E. Anderson, principal</td>
<td>390 Park Ave. Bloomfield, Conn. 06002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel School</td>
<td>Stanley J. Wilkowski, principal</td>
<td>1 Filley St. Bloomfield, Conn. 06002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacomet School</td>
<td>John E. Soldell, principal</td>
<td>185 School St. Bloomfield, Conn. 06002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Vincent</td>
<td>Nicholas D. Scappellati, principal</td>
<td>Turkey Hill Road Bloomfield, Conn. 06002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southeast Elementary School
Gerhardt Engelmann, principal
98th and Francisco Ave.
Evergreen Park, Ill. 60642
Southwest Elementary School
Phillip Pemberton, principal
99th and Central Park
Evergreen Park, Ill. 60642

ITASCA PUBLIC SCHOOLS #10
Arnold Rusche, Supt.
Elmer H. Franzen Elementary
Claude Drase, principal
730 North Catalpa St.
Itasca, Ill. 60143
Washington School
C. William Wareham, principal
301 East Washington St.
Itasca, Ill. 60143

JACKSONVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS #117
Dr. Clifford W. Crone, Supt.
Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary
Harry D. Emrick, principal
1801 West Lafayette Ave.
Jacksonville, Ill. 62650

LINCOLNWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS #74
Dr. Marvin O'Garlich, Supt.
Rutledge Hall
Dr. John Beckwith, principal
6950 East Prairie Road
Lincolnwood, Ill. 60645

LOMBARD PUBLIC SCHOOLS #44
Robert Chelseth, Supt.
Peter Hoy Elementary School
Robert Burckle, principal
620 South Finley Road
Lombard, Ill. 60148

MARISSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS #40
LeRoy Trost, Supt.
Marissa Elementary School
Marion E. Webb, principal
East Fulton St.
Marissa, Ill. 62257

MARKHAM COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #144
Harold Tompkins, Supt.
Pottawatomie (Chateaux)
Kenneth Hoffman, principal
171st and Holmes Ave.
Hazel Crest, Ill. 60429

MEDITAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Orval Trail, Supt.
South Elementary School
Dr. C. W. Bowman, principal
22 West—300 Sunnyside St.
Medinah, Ill. 60157

MOLINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS #40
Dr. Theodore F. Rockafellow, Supt.
Katherine Butterworth
Douglas Lewis, principal
4205 48th St.
Moline, Ill. 61265
Erikson School
Frank DeRocker, principal
335 Fifth Ave.
Moline, Ill. 61265
Grant School
Ben N. McAdams, principal
2430 Sixth Ave.
Moline, Ill. 61265
Lincoln-Irving School
Richard Larson, principal
1015 16th Ave.
Moline, Ill. 61265
Horace Mann
Richard Steelman, principal
R.R. #1
Box 115
Moline, Ill. 61265
MT. MORRIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS #261
David Turner, Supt.
Mt. Morris School
Ms. Stella Baker, principal
401 South Fletcher St.
Mt. Morris, Ill. 61054
MUNDELEIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS #75
Lyle Kiltzke, Supt.
Jefferson Elementary
Frank Miraglio, principal
330 North California Ave.
Mundelein, Ill. 60060
Lincoln Elementary
John P. Schockmel, principal
200 West Maple St.
Mundelein, Ill. 60060
Mechanics Grove School
E. C. Bonhiver, principal
1200 Midlothian Blvd.
Mundelein, Ill. 60060
Carl Sandburg Jr. High
A. D. Stealy, principal
855 West Hawley St.
Mundelein, Ill. 60060
Washington Elementary School
Jack Murrell, principal
122 South Garfield Ave.
Mundelein, Ill. 60060

OREGON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS #220
William Urbanek, Supt.
Nash Elementary
Mrs. Robert Day, principal
5th and Madison Sts.
Oregon, Ill. 61061

POPE COUNTY SCHOOLS #1
Ray Evans, Supt.
Golconda Grade School
Golconda, Ill. 62938

QUINCY PUBLIC SCHOOLS #172
William G. Alberts, Supt.
Lincoln School
Donald McKinley, principal
4th and Main Sts.
Quincy, Ill. 62301

ROANOKE-BENSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS #60
Frank Crawford, Supt.
Roanoke Grade School
Robert C. Lillie, principal
408 West Broad St.
Roanoke, Ill. 61051

SCHAUMBURG-ROSELLE SCHOOLS #54
Wayne E. Schable, Supt.
Hanover Highlands School
Robert J. Summerfield, principal
1451 Cypress Ave.
Hanover Park, Ill. 60172

TINLEY PARK PUBLIC SCHOOLS #146
Walter F. Fierke, Supt.
W. F. Fierke Education Center
E. Thomas, principal
17248 67th Ave.
c/o Central Jr. H.S.
Tinley Park, Ill. 60477

TROY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS #30
Don D. Bacon, Supt.
Troy-Cronin Multiunit Center
Ronald Luedeman, principal
Route 59 and Black Road
Joliet, Ill. 60435

UNION RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS #86
Karl O. Grandt, Supt.
Union Ridge School
Karl O. Grandt, principal
4600 North Oak Park Ave.
Harwood Heights, Ill. 60656

WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS #5
Merit Moore, Supt.
W. J. Zahnow Elementary
William Reeves, principal
301 Hamacher St.
Waterloo, Ill. 62298
## WEST CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS #33
Jerald Salmon, Supt.

- Pioneer School
  Douglas Weeder, principal
  615 Kenwood St.
  West Chicago, Ill. 60185

## WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY LABORATORY SCHOOL
L. Donald Hahn, Supt.

- Western Laboratory School
  L. Donald Hahn, principal
  Western Illinois University
  Macomb, Ill. 61455

## WOODLAND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS #50
Arden Luce, Supt.

- Woodland Elementary School
  John Mason, principal
  1700 Gages Lake Road
  Gages Lake, Ill. 60030

## INDIANA
GARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Gordon McAndrew, Supt.

- Beveridge School
  Edward Court, principal
  1234 Cleveland St.
  Gary, Ind. 46402

- Marquette School
  Max Lynch, principal
  6401 Rockwell St.
  Gary, Ind. 46402

- Riley Elementary School
  Alfred S. Sneed, principal
  1301 East 43rd St.
  Gary, Ind. 46409

INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Stanley Campbell, Supt.

- Arlington Wood School
  Mrs. Mary A. Carpenter, principal
  5801 East 30th St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46218

- Audubon School
  Mrs. Martha Ann Bradley, principal
  2050 Winter Ave.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46218

- Raymond Brandes School
  William F. Wilson, principal
  4065 Ashby St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46227

- George Washington Carver School
  Mrs. Mary K. Oxley, principal
  2411 Indianapolis Ave.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46226

- Charity Dye School
  J. Hayes, principal
  545 East 19th St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46202

- Flackville School
  Gordon E. Harker, principal
  2330 Lafayette Road
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46222

- Calvin Fletcher School
  Paul K. Smith, principal
  520 Virginia Ave.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46203

- Robert Frost School
  Mrs. Wilma D. Brown, principal
  5301 Roxbury Road
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46226

- Hazel Hart Hendricks School
  Mrs. Betty Chesley, principal
  2605 East 25th St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46218

- John Hope School
  San Langell, principal
  1301 East 16th St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46202

- Jonathan Jenning School
  Willard J. Powell, principal
  6150 Gateway Drive
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46254

- Susan Roll Leach School
  Ms. Thelma Thompson, principal
  2107 North Riley St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46218

- Henry Wadsworth Longfellow School
  Wayne Fairburn, principal
  501 Laurel St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46203

- James Russell Lowell School
  Mrs. Eula T. Warfield, principal
  2301 North Olney St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46218

- John McCormick School
  Mrs. Madeline Swatman, principal
  40 North Miller St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46222

- Dewitt Morgan School
  O'riele Rees, Jr., principal
  200 West 49th St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46208

- Perry Morton School
  Mrs. Estelle F. Reford, principal
  2101 College Ave.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46205

- Francis W. Parker School
  Benjamin Johnson, principal
  2533 Columbia St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46205

- School #113
  Theodore R. Cox, principal
  4352 North Milhofer St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46236

- Eleanor Skillen School
  Joseph A. O'Nan, principal
  1410 East Wade St.
  Indianapolis, Ind. 46203

## MASSACHUSETTS
BYAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Byam School
  Daniel F. Horgan, principal
  Maple Road
  Chelmsford, Mass. 01824

CHELMSFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Harrington School
  Mrs. Evelyn Demarals
  Richardson Road
  Chelmsford, Mass. 01824

FITCHBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS
McKay Campus School
  Dr. Robert Lee, principal
  Fitchburg State College
  Fitchburg, Mass. 01460

LAWRENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Storrow School
  Mrs. Catherine Rivet, principal
  50 Pleasant St.
  Lawrence, Mass. 01841

LITTLETON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Shattuck Street School
  Arthur Covell, principal
  Littleton, Mass. 01460

METHUEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Howe School
  Mrs. Margaret Ryan, principal
  11 Hampstead St.
  Methuen, Mass. 01844

Marsh School
  Mrs. Dorothy Zing, principal
  311 Pelham St.
  Methuen, Mass. 01844

TEWKSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Healthbrook School
  Nicholas Andronikos, principal
  Shawshin St.
  Tewksbury, Mass. 01876

TYNGSBORO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Winslow School
  Donald Brightman, principal
  Middlesex St.
  Tyngsboro, Mass. 01879

WESTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Valley View School
  John Allen, principal
  Robinson and Concord Roads
  Westford, Mass. 01886
Lake View Elementary
Dan Navratil, principal
300 Capitol Beach Blvd.
Lincoln, Neb. 68528

Pershing School
Vern Martin, principal
6402 Judson St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68507

Prescott Elementary
Bernard Nutt, principal
2024 South 20th St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68502

Randolph Elementary
Marlan Kaufman, principal
1024 South 37th St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68510

Maude Rousseau School
Mrs. Frances Enevoldsen, principal
3701 South 33rd St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68506

West Lincoln School
Dan Conway, principal
630 West Dawes St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68521

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Oakdale School
Dennis C. Hansen, principal
98th and Center Sts.
Omaha, Neb. 68114

NEW JERSEY

CAMDEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Charles Smerin, Supt.
Yorkshire Elementary School
Mrs. T. Sternberg, principal
Collins Road
Camden, N.J. 08101

CHATHAM BOROUGH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. James S. Collins, Supt.
Washington Avenue School
Arthur Ebeling, principal
Washington Ave.
Chatham, N.J. 07928

CHATHAM TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Elwood B. Jacoby, Supt.
Southern Boulevard Elementary
Miss Bernadette A. Jernick, principal
192 Southern Boulevard
Chatham, N.J. 07929

Caldwell-West Caldwell Public Schools
Eugene J. Bradford, Supt.
Lincoln Elementary
Miss Helen Galloway, principal
Crane St.
Caldwell, N.J. 07006

DOVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Frank Poulos, Supt.
Academy Street School
John Duffy, principal
Academy St.
Dover, N.J. 07801

EAST ORANGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Russell A. Jackson, Jr., Supt.
The Nassau School
Melvin Sanders, principal
330 Central Ave.
East Orange, N.J. 07017

GLEN RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
James F. Gray, Supt.
Linden Avenue School
Mrs. Evelyn Jan-Tausch, principal
Linden Ave.
Glen Ridge, N.J. 07028

HIGHLAND PARK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Roy D. Loux, Supt.
Irving School
Ronald Erikson, principal
South Eleventh Ave.
Highland Park, N.J. 08904

LAVALLETTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Russell O. Brackman, Pres.
Lavallette Elementary
Dr. Mahlon Merk, principal
Brooklyn Ave.
Lavallette, N.J. 08735

LIVINGSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Julius C. Bernstein, Supt.
Collins School
Leonard Bernstein, principal
67 Martin Road
Livingston, N.J. 07039

MADISON TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Patrick Torre, Supt.
Cheesequake School
Mrs. Nancy Mannings, principal
Highway 34
Matawan, N.J. 07747

MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Bernhardt Schneider, Supt.
Fairview Elementary
Robert Smith, principal
Cooper Road
Red Bank, N.J. 07701

NEWTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. David Adler, Supt.
Merriam Avenue School
Harry Selover, principal
Merriam Ave.
Newton, N.J. 07860

NORTH BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
James J. Clancy, Supt.
Maple Meadow School
Harvey Velnick, principal
Route 130
North Brunswick, N.J. 08902

PATerson PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Michael Cotta, Supt.
Public School #27
Mrs. Anne T. Carrera, principal
Richmond, Berkshire & Chatham Aves.
Paterson, N.J. 07505

PLEASANTVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Robert Wendland, Supt.
South Main Street School
John Garrity, principal
South Main St.
Pleasantville, N.J. 08232

POMPTON LAKE PUBLIC SCHOOL
Enrico J. Cipolato, Supt.
Lincoln School
Christian Stager, principal
Mill St.
Pompton Lake, N.J. 07442

RED BANK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Robert Hoops, Supt.
The Red Bank Primary School
Vincent Finelli, principal
River St.
Red Bank, N.J. 07701

RIVER EDGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. John Levigne, Supt.
Holly M. Davis Elementary
John Choka, principal
Cole Court
River Edge, N.J. 07661

SECAUCUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Arthur F. Couch, Supt.
Claremont School
Miss Rita Kock, principal
685 Fifth St.
Secaucus, N.J. 07094

TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Ercell I. Watson, Supt.
Wilson School
Joseph Cordero, principal
Girard Ave.
Trenton, N.J. 08611

VENTNOR CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Chester Ogden, Supt.
Ventnor Middle School
Mrs. Margaret S. DiMatteo, principal
Ventnor City, N.J. 08406
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VINELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Anthony Catrambone, Supt.
Winslow School
John Richards, principal
Magnolia Ave.
Vineland, N.J. 08360

WAYNE TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS
David H. O'Grady, Supt.
Packanack School
Richard York, principal
190 Oakwood Drive
Wayne, N.J. 07470

WHARTON BOROUGH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Thomas C. O'Rourke, Supt.
Wharton Public School
Francis De Bell, principal
East Central Ave.
Wharton, N.J. 07885

NEW YORK
CASSADAGA VALLEY CENTRAL SCHOOLS
Samuel S. Danton, Supt.
Cassadaga Elementary
Wendell Crabtree, principal
175 Maple Ave.
Cassadaga, N.Y. 14718

Gerry Elementary
Elmer Horey, principal
Gerry, N.Y. 14740

Sinclairville Elementary
Elmer Horey, principal
Sinclairville, N.Y. 14782

Stockton Elementary
Wendell Crabtree, principal
Stockton, N.Y. 14784

FALCONER CENTRAL SCHOOLS
James H. Gassman, Supt.
Ellington Elementary
Rudolf Donn, principal
Ellington, N.Y. 14701

Harvey C. Fenner Elementary
Herbert I. F. Carlson, principal
Falconer, N.Y. 14733

North Side School
Mrs. Lucy Mula, principal
North Work St.
Falconer, N.Y. 14733

South Side School
Richard Pond, principal
South Work St.
Falconer, N.Y. 14733

Temple Elementary Building
Donald S. Lazarony, principal
Grubb Hill Road
Kennedy, N.Y. 14747

NIAGARA FALLS SCHOOLS
Henry J. Kifas, Supt.
Pacific Avenue School
Willfred L. Young, principal
7116 Buffalo Ave.
Niagara Falls, N.Y. 14302

SOUTHERN CENTRAL SCHOOLS
Dr. Philip C. Frost, Supt.
Glidden Elementary
Ms. Lois Hough, principal
7 Glidden Ave., N.D.
West Ellicott, N.Y. 14701

WILLIAMSVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOLS
Dr. William E. Keller, Supt.
Maple West Elementary
Anthony E. Link, principal
851 Maple Road
Williamsville, N.Y. 14221

OHIO
BOARDMAN LOCAL SCHOOLS
Grant F. Kibbel, Supt.
Market Street School
Harold E. Cullar, principal
5555 Market St.
Boardman, Ohio 44512

CENTERVILLE CITY SCHOOLS
Dr. Donald Overly, Supt.
Normandy Elementary
Robert Savage, principal
401 Normandy Ridge Road
Dayton, Ohio 45459

C. L. Stingley Multilift Elementary
James M. Schrote, principal
95 Linden Drive
Centerville, Ohio 45459

Village South Elementary
Mrs. Jean N. Vesper, principal
6450 Marshall Road
Centerville, Ohio 45459

LIBERTY LOCAL SCHOOLS
H. M. Wilds, Supt.
William S. Guy School
William R. Dunmire, principal
4115 Shady Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44505

MISISSINAWA VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Douglas Reeves, Supt.
East Side School
Dr. Joseph B. Carrot, principal
116 Sycamore St.
Union City, Ohio 43790

OREGON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Victor C. Wood, Supt.
Starr Elementary School
Don Bennett, principal
3230 Starr Ave.
Oregon, Ohio 43616

TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Frank Dick, Supt.
Glendale School
Philip Schneider, principal
4746 Glendale Ave.
Toledo, Ohio 43614

Martin Luther King School
Al Mackie, principal
1415 Lawrence Ave.
Toledo, Ohio 43607

Old Orchard School
Bruce Kuntz, principal
2402 Cheltenham Road
Toledo, Ohio 43605

Wallbridge School
Ms. Patricia A. Kennedy, principal
1245 Walbridge Ave.
Toledo, Ohio 43609

Washington School
Alvin Stephens, principal
514 Palmwood St.
Toledo, Ohio 43602

WARREN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Dr. Richard A. Boyd, Supt.
McKinley School
Albert R. Rich, principal
1321 Elm Road, N.E.
Warren, Ohio 44483

XENIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
William M. West, Supt.
Cox Elementary
John C. Balm, principal
506 Dayton Ave.
Xenia, Ohio 45385

Simon Kenton Elementary
Armie Adams, principal
1087 West Second St.
Xenia, Ohio 45385

McKinley Elementary
Richard W. Bennett, principal
228 West Market St.
Xenia, Ohio 45386

Spring Valley School
Wilgus J. Napier, principal
Spring Valley-Pointersville Road
Spring Valley, Ohio 45370

YELLOW SPRINGS EXEMPTED VILLAGE SCHOOLS
Lloyd Benham, Supt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mills Lawn Elementary</strong></td>
<td>Mrs. Alice Flowers, principal</td>
<td>230 Walnut St.</td>
<td>Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUNGSTOWN DIOCESE SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Msgr. William Hughes, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaculate Conception School</td>
<td>Sister Teresa Winsen, principal</td>
<td>810 Oak St.</td>
<td>Youngstown, Ohio 44505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUNGSTOWN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Richard Vierling, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul C. Bunn School</td>
<td>Samuel A. Loree, principal</td>
<td>1825 Sequoya Drive</td>
<td>Youngstown, Ohio 44514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan School</td>
<td>Ms. Ruth Bowers, principal</td>
<td>3323 Hudson Ave.</td>
<td>Youngstown, Ohio 44511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABBEVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>R. H. Gettys, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Elementary</td>
<td>J. E. Copeland, principal</td>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>Abbeville, S.C. 29620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Dr. G. T. Myers, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Aiken Elementary</td>
<td>Kenneth V. Willis, principal</td>
<td>Old Wagener Road</td>
<td>Aiken, S.C. 29801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Spring-Monetta School</td>
<td>B. Wade Nobles, principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 386</td>
<td>Ridge Spring, S.C. 29129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERKELEY COUNTY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Henry Bonner, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Elementary</td>
<td>James A. Arnold, principal</td>
<td>107 West Main St.</td>
<td>Moncks Corner, S.C. 29461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td>Gordon Garrett, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Birney Elementary School</td>
<td>Andrew Young, principal</td>
<td>7750 Pinehurst St.</td>
<td>Charleston Heights, S.C. 29405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHESTER COUNTY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>E. W. Nummerly, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisville Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Jennie K. Kelly, principal</td>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>Box 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Elementary</td>
<td>Gary E. Douglas, principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7</td>
<td>Ruby, S.C. 29741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere Elementary</td>
<td>Miss Virginia Pack, principal</td>
<td>3602 Thourmond St.</td>
<td>Columbia, S.C. 29204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Alice B. Mangum, principal</td>
<td>Box 498</td>
<td>Darlington, S.C. 29532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee Elementary</td>
<td>Sam P. Mussey, principal</td>
<td>P. 0. C. 584</td>
<td>Hardeeville, S.C. 29927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Elementary</td>
<td>Alexander H. Boykin, principal</td>
<td>Campbell St.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald-Green Elementary</td>
<td>Miss Anne R. Nims, principal</td>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>Lancaster, S.C. 29720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisville Elementary</td>
<td>W. C. Hawkins, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks Elementary</td>
<td>Wm. Tim Brown, principal</td>
<td>2800 Ashland Road</td>
<td>Columbia, S.C. 29210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS #1</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Claud E. Kitchens, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caughman Road Middle School</td>
<td>Clifford L. Harkey, principal</td>
<td>7725 Caughman Road</td>
<td>Columbia, S.C. 29209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS #2</strong></td>
<td>W. H. Parrish, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythewood Elementary</td>
<td>James H. Hall, Jr., principal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 20</td>
<td>Blythewood, S.C. 29016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Dr. L. C. McArthur, Jr., Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Drive Elementary</td>
<td>D. F. Barber, Jr., principal</td>
<td>Willow Drive</td>
<td>Sumter, S.C. 29150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>S. John Davis, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Sherman Elementary</td>
<td>Mrs. Irene Lober, principal</td>
<td>6630 Brawner St.</td>
<td>McLean, Va. 22101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISCONSIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALGOMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Gerald F. Thielke, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algoma Elementary School</td>
<td>Marvin J. Silskie, principal</td>
<td>514 Freeport St.</td>
<td>Algoma, Wis. 54201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLETON PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Orlyn Ziemer, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEENAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Donald Scott, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge Elementary School</td>
<td>321 Alcott Drive, Neenah, Wis.</td>
<td>Donald E. Gebhardt, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald E. Gebhardt, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Elementary</td>
<td>201 Alcott Drive, Neenah, Wis.</td>
<td>Donald Feit, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Feit, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Elementary</td>
<td>1645 South Commercial St., Neenah, Wis. 54956</td>
<td>Ted L. Jarosh, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullar Elementary</td>
<td>925 Tullar Road, Neenah, Wis. 54956</td>
<td>Lloyd H. Thede, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullar Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OAK CREEK-FRANKLIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Brosenick, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard Hills Elementary School</td>
<td>9701 South Shephard Hills Drive</td>
<td>Larry V. Tylke, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry V. Tylke, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCONOMOWOC PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William Paton, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashippun Elementary School</td>
<td>295A CTH 0, Oconomowoc, Wis. 53066</td>
<td>David E. Engen, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David E. Engen, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit School</td>
<td>36316 Valley Road, Oconomowoc, Wis. 53066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OREGON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Helgesen, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Middle School</td>
<td>300 Soden Drive, Oregon, Wis. 53975</td>
<td>Edward Guzlewski, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Guzlewski, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLYMOUTH PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden Amundson, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview School</td>
<td>1721 Northview Road, Plymouth, Wis. 53073</td>
<td>Miss Marian Ubbelohde, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Marian Ubbelohde, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAUKESHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kenneth H. Reinke, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Elementary School</td>
<td>1721 Northview Road, Waukesha, Wis. 53186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST ALLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing School</td>
<td>1330 South 47th St., Milwaukee, Wis. 53214</td>
<td>Emil C. Krejcarak, principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST BEND PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John D. Bowser, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISCONSIN elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Address Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson School</td>
<td>William E. Josten, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 Jackson Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson, Wis. 53037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean School</td>
<td>John Cain, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>833 Chestnut St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend, Wis. 53095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST DE PERE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Neal Richtman, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Elementary</td>
<td>Raymond F. Dohl, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1155 Westwood Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN DELLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>R. W. Fenske, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Dells Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Schultz, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 Washington Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Dells, Wis. 53965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN HEIGHTS PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Mark Druml, Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Earth Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evan Vieragge, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Earth, Wis. 53515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mazomanie Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Lampsa, principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314 Anne St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mazomanie, Wis. 53560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current as of May 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGE/Multiunit Schools with Relationships with /I/D/E/A/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator: Tom Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002 Haley Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, Ala. 36830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTOONA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank D. Heatherly, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona, Ala. 35992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNISTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Park Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. R. Trammel, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 West 17th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniston, Ala. 36201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBURN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boykin Street Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eldon Johnson, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, Ala. 36830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULLMAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Clarke, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Rosemont Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullman, Ala. 35055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOTHAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy D. Ward, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Powell St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothan, Ala. 36301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLECTIC PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Wingett, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic, Ala. 36024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempsey F. Rutherford, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironside St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, Ala. 35630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Bay Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Trousalof, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Bay, Ala. 36541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEADLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headland Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Commander, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headland, Ala. 36345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTSVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonnell Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Hall, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010 Binderton Place, Southwest Huntsville, Ala. 35805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPELINA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperell Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Martha Bailey, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperell Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opelika, Ala. 36801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHENIX PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlawn Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis E. Brummett, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709 Meadowlawn Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenix City, Ala. 36867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Lorna West, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selma, Ala. 36701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSSVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Gordon, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Chalkville Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussville, Ala. 35173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator: Miss Marguerite Debhotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocese of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 North Michigan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill. 60611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaculate Conception School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Joan Baldridge, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431 North North Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity BVM School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Agnes Calmeen, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537 North Lawndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Mary Elizabeth, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7839 South Chappel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Lady of the Ridge School
Sister Mary Phyllis, principal
10810 South Oxford Ave.
Chicago Ridge, Ill. 60416

Queen of All Saints School
Sister Regina Crowley, principal
6230 North Western
St. Bonaventure School
Sister Diann Musial, principal
1651 West Diversey
St. Cecelia School
Sister Nadine Hargadon, principal
220 West 45th Place
St. Joseph School
Sister Francis Marie Harwas, principal
1065 North Orleans
St. Philip Nerl School
Sister Nora O'Brien, principal
321 East 54th St.
Providence of God School
Sister Jeanette, principal
1065 North Orleans

IOWA
Facilitator: Jerry Mills
Studebaker Elementary School
300 East County Line Road
Des Moines, Iowa 50315

DES MOINES PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Findley Elementary School
Miss Nadine Machesney, principal
3000 Cambridge St.

Jackson Elementary School
Mrs. Marion Pritchard, principal
3825 Indiana Road
Oak Park Elementary School
Miss Joan Sherman, principal
3928 Sixth Ave.
Stowe Elementary School
Keith VanHorn, principal
1411 East 33rd St.
Studebaker Elementary School
Jerry Mills, principal
300 East County Line Road

NOTE: In September, 1972, these additional Des Moines schools will begin operating as IGE schools. They are:

Pleasant Hill Elementary School
Lovejoy Elementary School
Jefferson Elementary School
Mann Elementary School
Park Avenue School
Willard Elementary School
Brooks Elementary School
Hanawalt Elementary School

MINNESOTA
Facilitator: Frank Nauyokas
Southwest Minnesota State College
Marshall, Minn. 56258

LAKEFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Lakefield Elementary
Herbert Peterson, principal
Lakefield, Minn. 56150

ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Washington School
Dave Strand, principal
Alexandria, Minn. 56308

OHIO
Facilitators: Dave Ashby
Director, Elementary Instruction & Curriculum
Dayton Public Schools
348 West First St.
Dayton, Ohio 45402
Dr. James Steele
College of Education
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

DAYTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Cornell Heights School
Frederick Clark, principal
2826 Campus Drive
Edison School
Mrs. Elizabeth Hatcher, principal
228 North Broadway
St. McKinley School
Ronald Decker, principal
3725 Evansville Ave.
Fairport School
Irving Moses, principal
1952 Fairport Ave.
Franklin School
Mrs. Berntse James, principal
2617 East Fifth St.

Grace A. Greene School
Harrison Dixon, principal
503 Edison Ave.

Hawthorne School
Robert Jones, principal
225 McDaniel St.

Irving School
John C. Lesko, principal
395 Cincinnati St.

Jefferson School
Peter Lasota, principal
1231 North Euclid Ave.

Jefferson School
Mrs. Wertha Dugger, principal
1233 North Euclid Ave.

Kemp School
Robert Dobbs, principal
816 Sheddourne Ave.

Longfellow School
Gregory Garas, principal
245 Salem Ave.

Louise Troy School
Mrs. Viola Lloyd, principal
1665 Richley Ave.

MacFarlane School
George Johnson, principal
215 South Summit St.

McNary School
Robert Spreng, principal
2400 Hoover Ave.

Miami Chapel School
Dr. Doris Brown, principal
1630 Miami Chapel

Orville Wright School
Donald Garretson, principal
200 South Wright Ave.

Van Cleve School
Joe VanTine, principal
45 West Helena Drive

Washington School
Raleigh Jackson, principal
2900 East First St.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaver School</td>
<td>Mrs. Thelma J. Brown</td>
<td>2000 Howell</td>
<td>Whittier, Ohio 44512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier School</td>
<td>Phillip Prather</td>
<td>721 Miami Chapel</td>
<td>Whittier, Ohio 44512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Drive School</td>
<td>Al Taylor</td>
<td>111 Stadium Drive, Boardman, Ohio 44512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield School</td>
<td>Tom Winsor</td>
<td>121 East Delason Ave. Youngstown, Ohio 44507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGSTOWN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Drive School</td>
<td>Al Taylor, principal</td>
<td>111 Stadium Drive, Boardman, Ohio 44512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield School</td>
<td>Tom Winsor, principal</td>
<td>121 East Delason Ave. Youngstown, Ohio 44507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Elementary School</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Phipps, principal</td>
<td>Route 5, Johnson City, Tenn. 37601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Springs Elementary School</td>
<td>Frank Wright, principal</td>
<td>Route 6, Johnson City, Tenn. 37601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Elementary School</td>
<td>Ms. Selma Maltimer, principal</td>
<td>Southwest Ave., Johnson City, Tenn. 37601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGSPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johnson School</td>
<td>Thomas R. Milam, principal</td>
<td>Ormond Drive, Kingsport, Tenn. 37664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison Elementary School</td>
<td>Mrs. Reba Robinette, principal</td>
<td>200 Greenway St., Kingsport, Tenn. 37660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator: Floyd Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRISTOL PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holston Heights School</td>
<td>Mrs. Jane Whitlow, principal</td>
<td>100 Cannon St., Bristol, Tenn. 37620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Elementary School</td>
<td>Wm. J. Morrell, Jr., principal</td>
<td>2031 Broad St., Bristol, Tenn. 37620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETHTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenburg Elementary School</td>
<td>Thurman J. Elliot, principal</td>
<td>Route 3, Elizabethton, Tenn. 37643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Elementary School</td>
<td>Daniel Holker, principal</td>
<td>Route 5, Elizabethton, Tenn. 37643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Elementary School</td>
<td>Will H. Andrews, principal</td>
<td>Burgie St., Elizabethton, Tenn. 37643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONESBORO PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone Creek Elementary</td>
<td>John Manning, principal</td>
<td>Route 4, Jonesboro, Tenn. 37659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro Elementary School</td>
<td>Early Henley, principal</td>
<td>Main St., Jonesboro, Tenn. 37659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Elementary School</td>
<td>Bob Anderson, principal</td>
<td>1700 Cherry, Aberdeen, Wash. 98520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERETT PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Middle School</td>
<td>Jim Hopkins, principal</td>
<td>2500 100th Ave., S.E., Everett, Wash. 98201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Reports by the Editors of Education U.S.A.

Dropouts: Prevention and Rehabilitation—Schools Rescue Potential Failures. Focuses on programs which appear to be yielding results and which can be adapted to other schools. 1972, 56 pp., #411-12826. $4.

Performance Contracting in Schools: Profit Motive Tested As Incentive to Learning. Different types of contracts; testing; Texarkana project; Banneker Elementary School project; new terminology; opinion of public, parents, students, boards. 1972, 64 pp., #411-12824. $4.

Schoolgirl Pregnancy: Old Problem; New Solutions. Court decisions; rulings by state education departments; refutations of old arguments; pros and cons of regular vs. special classes; sample school policies. 1972, 64 pp., #411-12822. $4.

Student Rights and Responsibilities: Courts Force Schools To Change. What rights students have under the Constitution; recent court decisions; how schools also stress student responsibilities; sample local policies. 1972, 64 pp., #411-12814. $4.

PPBS and the School: New System Promotes Efficiency, Accountability. Pros and cons of PPBS, a management tool to plan and manage a school district's activities and resources. Specific examples. 1972, 56 pp., #411-12810. $4.

Paraprofessionals in Schools: How New Careerists Bolster Education. How paraprofessionals are helping to increase student achievement and free teachers to teach; what they do on the job; how to recruit, train, supervise them. 1972, 64 pp., #411-12804. $4.

Year-Round School: Districts Develop Successful Programs. Definitions, advantages and disadvantages, comparative cost figures, and capsule review of 20 districts operating a year-round program, plus comprehensive case studies. 1971, 64 pp., #411-12802. $4.


Differentiated Staffing in Schools. Strengths, weaknesses and pitfalls of differentiated staffing; facts and opinions on this revolutionary and controversial method of staff organization. 1970, 48 pp., #411-12754. $4.

Reading Crisis: The Problem and Suggested Solutions. A roundup of the most significant recent discoveries on reading problems and a guide to supervisory and teaching techniques that work. 1970, 48 pp., #411-12766. $4.

Vandalism and Violence: Innovative Strategies Reduce Cost to Schools. Measures school systems are taking to achieve security, deter crime, handle bomb threats; roles of security personnel; how to involve students and community in preventive programs. 1971, 56 pp., #411-12794. $4.

Individualization in Schools: The Challenge and the Options. How eight major individualization systems are providing individualized instruction to thousands of students in reading, math, science and social studies. 1971, 64 pp., #411-12792. $4.

Environment and the Schools. Programs under way in states, local school districts, colleges and universities. Philosophy and objectives of a good environmental education program. 1971, 64 pp., #411-12780. $4.

Vocational Education: Innovations Revolutionize Career Training. Successful career training programs in elementary and secondary schools, unique developments and innovative programs, amount and intended purpose of federal appropriations. 1971, 64 pp., #411-12798. $4.

Drug Crisis: Schools Fight Back with Innovative Programs. The problem in perspective, specifics of what is essential for a successful school drug abuse program, programs considered most successful. 1971, 61 pp., #411-12796. $4.

Address communications and make checks payable to the National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209.